HISTORICAL RECORDS AND STUDIES

UNITED STATES CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY

HISTORICAL RECORDS AND STUDIES

OFFICE OF
THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE SOCIETY
NO. 346 CONVENT AVENUE, NEW YORK

UNITED STATES CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY

HISTORICAL RECORDS AND STUDIES

THOMAS F. MEEHAN, PERCY J. KING
HENRY RIDDER

Editing Committee

VOLUME XIX

SEPTEMBER, 1929

NEW YORK
THE UNITED STATES CATHOLIC
HISTORICAL SOCIETY
1929

Copyright 1929
by
THE UNITED STATES CATHOLIC
HISTORICAL SOCIETY

CONTENTS

Frontispiece
Reproduction The Codex Saville
The Codex Saville: America's Oldest Book 7
Rev. Mariano Cuevas, S.J.

Blessed Isaac Jogues 21
Rev. Francis X. Talbot, S.J.

Archbishop Hughes and Mexico 33
Thomas F. Meehan

James Shields, Soldier, Justice, Senator 41
John G. Coyle, M.D.

The Centenary of American Catholic Fiction 52
Thomas F. Meehan

Beginnings of Government in Maryland 73
Grace H. Sherwood

Two Pioneer Russian Missionaries 105
Thomas F. Meehan

General Meeting of May 16, 1928 110
Editor

The Presentation to the Holy Father 119
Editor

Annual Election of Officers 121
Editor

Notes and Comments 123
Editor

List of Members 134

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/historicalrecord0000thom

CATHOLIC HISTORICAL RECORDS AND STUDIES

THE CODEX SAVILLE: AMERICA'S OLDEST BOOK

Rev. Mariano Cuevas, S.J.

Member of the Royal Historical Academy of Spain and of the American Antiquarian Society

It has always been the privilege of the first reader of or commentator on a Codex to give it an appropriate name. It is therefore a pleasant duty for me to designate as the Codex Saville this pre-Columbian Mexican historical paper, now for the first time published under the auspices of the United States Catholic Historical Society. This is the honor due to Doctor Marshall H. Saville whose merits and brilliant successes during the last forty-five years are so much appreciated by students of the ancient history of the Latin-American countries.

The Codex Saville was recently secured in Lima, Peru, by the Heye Foundation of New York City. It is still only provisionally catalogued.

Its size is 57 x 5 inches (1,45 mts. x 0,26 mts.) It is made of the native *maguey* or *agave* American fibre, conglutinated by a vegetable pulp called in the *nahuatl* or Mexican language *zazalic*. Some linen finished marks that appear here and there on the Codex, are only surface clothprints from outside pressure on the paste used at some recent date to put together the separate fragments.

Three small patches of the same native paper were pasted on the main part of the Codex in order, it seems, to correct some dates or data. One of these little papers pasted about the year 1453 is of the utmost importance. Notice that the upper part of it was afterwards scratched out, thus again making visible the

original painted sign of the cycle: similar to the one at the right side of the year 1455.

Originally the Codex was not in colors. These were poorly applied by the painter of the upper and later part some time about 1531.

There were at least two *tecuilos* (painters) of this *amatl* (painting paper.) The first one started before 1454; possibly in 1440. The last one, of the remaining part of the Codex was at his work about 1557. Names of different Mexican towns, most of them now illegible, were written all through the Codex in Spanish characters but with the typical Indian handwriting of the middle of the sixteenth century.

Before commenting on the Codex, I believe that some previous interpretations will be welcomed by readers who are not very familiar either with Codex-reading or with Mexican history and technique.

1. *The Chronology*: The elaborated Chronology of the Nahuatl peoples, inherited, it is said, from the Toltecs, has been fully illustrated and published by many first-class authors.[1] For the reading of this Codex it is sufficient to bear in mind the main divisions of the time, among the old Mexicans. Their cycle was not of one hundred years but the natural one of fifty-two years. This cycle was divided into four groups each of thirteen years ($4\times13=52$). Four different signs were employed to name the years: *tochli* (rabbit); *acatl* (reed); *tecatl* (stone) and *calli* (house). Each year was named by a combination of one of the above four signs mentioned in succession, together with the corresponding number of the group of thirteen years, named also successively, *v.g.*: 1, *tochtli;* 2, *acatl;* 3, *tecpatl;* 4, *calli;* 5, *tochtli* —and so on until after a period of fifty-two years the same sign occurred again with the same number. The same combination could not occur in the same cycle. A picture of the Codex Aubin shows the cycle as conceived by the Aztecs.

Each cycle was supposed to have its own discriminating name,

[1]See Orozco y Berra: "Historia Antigua di le Conquiste." Mexico, 1870; Vol. II, c. III.

OLD MEXICAN CHRONOLOGICAL CYCLE

but as a matter of fact it was not kept in mind; because the Mexicans were satisfied to know their own life cycle and perhaps the next to it. Hence the confusion about some dates previous to the fourteenth century.

II. *History.* Some time about the end of the twelfth century of our Christian era, seven branches of the race Nahuatl (meaning "clear talking people,") were wandering at a very slow rate all through the present Mexican Republic. The origin of these people still remains a mystery. With the exception of their very last "pilgrimage" in the region south of the grand plateau of Mexico, the rest of their wanderings are almost lost in the mist of pre-history. One of these seven branches, called *tenochca* and later on *Mexicas* made a final halt (1318) in the center of the present city "because there they saw the unequivocal sign given by the gods: an eagle upon a cactus, devouring a snake."[2]

An older tradition, given as such by a reliable source[3] was that the sign to stop the wandering of the Mexicans should be a white oak in the middle of the lake.

As soon as the Mexicans made up their minds to remain there, they began to build dikes to protect their swamp dwellings or Venice-like town from the main surrounding lake. Hence the very first name of the city, which, according to Tezozomoc, was not Mexico but *Atl-itc* meaning "water surrounded by a wall." The finishing of that dike, six years later in 1324, was a very good reason to give that date as the foundation of the city. The Codex Saville by giving the date 9 *acatl* (1319) for the end of the pilgrimage, or the beginning of the foundation and 1 *tecpal* (1324) for the end of the foundation, is the best solution to the endless dispute about that important event.

After the death of the leading warrior Tenoch, of which the date is uncertain, the Mexicans began to "elect" their absolute rulers. Following the Spanish conquerors, although most im-

---

[2]If it is not a real tradition it is at least the hierogliphic of what really took place, namely that the Mexicas stopped where their explorers bade them. Now, the names of the first explorer was Cuahu-coatl meaning precisely *"eagle with snake"* and he was sent and *supported* by *Tenoch* meaning precisely *"cactus upon the rock."* An eagle upon a cactus therefore could be in Mexico a unique and unequivocal sign?

[3]Cronica de Mexico" por don Fernando Alvarado Tezozomoc written in the sixteenth century. Printed in Mexico, 1898, Cap. IX.

properly, we still call them "Kings." Their names, as well as the hieroglyphic to represent them, and the corresponding English translations, are as follows:

Acamapichtli
Handful of reeds—female snake.

Huitzihuitl
Humming bird.

Chimalpopoca
Smoking shield.

Itzcoatl
Sword-back serpent

Moctezuma I.
Wrathy-lord

Axayacatl
Face in the water.

Tizoc
Wounded leg.

Ahuizotl
Water rat.

Moctezuma II.
Wrathy-lord

Progress and existence itself became impossible for the Mexicans, confined as they were, within their diked swamp-town. Meanwhile the Tecpanecas, owners of the lands surrounding the lake, would not give the Mexicans any chance for expansion. The latter, furthermore, were continuously insulted by the powerful Tecpaneca King, Maxtla. He used to call them effeminate people. Mexican ambassadors sent to him by King Itzcohuatl in 1432 were again insulted, dressed in women's robes and forced to return in this guise from Tlatelolco to Mexico. No one was thus more humiliated than the head of the embassy, the famous Moctezuma, afterwards Emperor of Mexico.

The rage provoked in the Mexicans by such an outrage finally led to the ferocious war lasting five years. The courage of the Mexicans and the skill of their leaders, Moctezuma and King Izcoatl, defeated the Tecpanecas. They became masters of the whole grand valley of Mexico and thus had an open door for the conquest of the rest of the country.

King Itzcoatl after celebrating his triumph, initiated a series of substantial reformations in the politics of his much enlarged kingdom. A very useful one was the institution of a Council of State to be formed by four prominent noblemen. Out of them the successor for the throne should be selected, thus avoiding the probability of much dangerous competition. This council was instituted during the fifth year of Itzcohuatl, A. D. 1437.

Moctezuma I, the next following ruler, carried a victorious war against his powerful Huaxteca neighbors thus becoming master of the eastern sea-shore and proving once more that the women's dresses given him by Maxtla were not appropriate.

King Axayacatl was shamefully defeated by Tarasco's brave warriors. Old Mexican historians prefer to forget this unexpected misfortune. They rather turn their eyes to the pompous allies of Mexico, the rich and learned kings of Tezcoco. The most conspicuous of them was Netzahualpilli meaning "hungry child." He was crowned in 1471.

After the short reign of Tizoc the Mexican throne was occupied by Ahuitzotl one of the most cruel monsters ever seen. The dedication he made of the double temple in 1487, sacrificing more than 20,000 innocent men, stained the history of Mexico forever.

Moctezuma II. crowned in 1502 saw the punishment of such a "civilization" when in 1519 "white men, bearded, silver plated" riding on "big hornless deers" with sword and fire overthrew the Mexican empire.

Nothing from that time could be recorded with pleasure by the *tlacuilos* or history painters. All was pain and disgrace, until in 1526 the Franciscan missionaries, who had arrived two years before, mastered the Nahuatl language and began the evangelization of the country. They started this work by erecting an enormous wooden Cross that could be seen for several leagues around, in their churchyard.

Another fact of great importance in Mexican history and Mexican life was the apparition of the Madonna that, according to tradition and reliable documents, took place in 1531 a few miles north of Mexico City, where the present National shrine stands.

All this data about the old Mexican history have been known and printed by many reliable authors long ago and independently of this Codex. In fact no one seems to have even quoted it, lost as it was from the middle of the sixteenth century.

It is fascinating to find records of these main lines in a five century old document which is a first hand work taken directly from contemporary life by eye-witness historians. Of course this book, like all of its age and like many of our own age, would be meaningless without some commentaries. They could only be memoranda, to be commented on by specially trained men called *amoxoaque,* meaning "men explaining the old paintings."

Reading of the Codex

The series of historical events herein contained was methodically coordinated and framed in the vertical ruler-line, at the right as you read. There we find, reading up, eight groups, each consisting of a corpse and a living man; both are connected with one of the disques in the line indicating a certain year.

From the characteristic hierogliphic placed upon the heads of most of the figures, we can recognize with certainty the series of the Mexican rulers from 1422 to 1520. It is a most valuable chronologic series and may give the last word to what seemed an endless controversy about the dates of the Mexican rulers prior to 1468.

According to the *tlacuilo* of the Codex Saville the succession of the Mexican "kings" was as follows:

Acamapichtli	undated
Huitzihuitl	died 1422
Chimalpopoca	1422-1432
Itzcohuatl	1432-1445
Moctezuma I.	1445-1467
Axayacatl	1468-1481
Tizoc	1481-1486
Ahuitzotl	1486-1502
Moctezuma II.	1502-undated

Cuitlahuac and Cuahutemoc, emperors for a short time after the conquest, are, of course, not mentioned.

The inside column of the Codex which is also to be read upwards, has to be divided into two parts: the pre-Cortesian and the post-Cortesian.

A.—In the first one we have to consider several groups. The arrival of the Mexicans at their final resting place is clearly shown by the natural sign of footprints. Some archeologists maintain that footprints of both feet, in hieroglyphic language, mean the act of climbing. If this statement is well founded, so much the better for the reading of this part, since the last steps of the Mexicans were nothing but climbing to the two thousand feet high Mexican plateau, where they settled.

B.—The majestically enthroned King, as far as we can tell, is Acamapichtli. The nickname for the position he held at the time of his election was *cihua coatl* (female serpent). Now the woman's face in an initiated snake body is just his hieroglyphic expressed in this very way by the Codex Mendocino.

C.—The oldest name of the City of Mexico. Its white oak as well as the "water surrounded by a dike" cannot be better indicated than they are in the group nearer to the sign *"one stone."*

The period of five years (1318-1324) which it took the Mexicans to settle and build their city, is just the one given in our Codex. The date 9 reed (1318) coincides

with the last footprint or final stop of the Mexicans, and the year "one stone" (1324) is in front of the white oak. These are precisely the two dates given by the best authorities for the foundation of Mexico. The signs, though, are to be related to the fourteenth century: The Indian painter, living in the fifteenth century was as sure as we are now, by tradition, that the two dates were "nine *acatl*" and "one *tecpal*" but he could not be more precise, for as is pointed out, their method for discriminating the cycles, although theoretically good, was out of practice in the fifteenth century.

D.—A period of twenty-two years was covered by the big war and conquest of the Tecpaneca lands. The two dominant figures, Itzcohuatl and Moctezuma, are embraced in it. The main political event, the Council of the Four selected noblemen, is clearly shown. Here they are seen having a regular session just in front of the date of their appointment, on the fifth year of Itzcohuatl's reign, 10 *acatl* (1437).

E.—The final triumph of Moctezuma I, the "woman-like" ambassador, over his powerful enemies, is beautifully synthetized by the picture of a king in full robe and with hair, dressed like a woman but, nevertheless, on top of another much bigger king whose crown has been taken away. This symbolizes the events of the year 1457 as it appears in our Codex.

F.—The names of towns written in Spanish characters, although of much later date, make us think that the second painter, or a commentarist, in the sixteenth century, had some vague idea that these three groups give a comprehensive view of that important war period. The towns whose names are still legible certainly were very closely connected with that war. Such are, for instance, Azcaputzalco, Talalpam (*sic*), Heichilputi (*sic*) (now Churubuzco), Tacahuaya (for Atlicuahuayan, now Tacubaya), Miahuatlan, and Tepeapulco.

G.—The next prominent figure in the Codex is King Netzahualpilli just facing the year 1471 of his election. His hieroglyphic is most appropriately that of a "hungry child."

The reasons for his appearance among the Mexican rulers were given in our previous notes in this commentary.

H.—Ahuitzotl, the monster of cruelty and his indelible national crime: the dedication of the two parallel shrines (Huitzilopochtli and Tezcalipuca) are plainly painted in the direction of the sign "10 rabbit" (1486) the very date given by the best historians.

On the upper part of the sheet, under the date 2 houses (1533) a similar figure is given. Evidently it is not a picture of any actual event, as no Mexican ruler, no temples, no sacrifices had lasted after 1526. It is the picture of something that the *tecuilo* took for granted that was going to happen, if the ritual laws were to be kept; and, we add, if the Spanish conquest, which the *tecuilo* could not forsee had not come to stop that rite or sacrifice. This anonymous king with his two temples ready for the sacrifice, is possibly the expression of the sacrifice prescribed for the middle of the cycle, which had to occur precisely in 1533, or (1507-26) as it comes in our Codex.

Part II: Post-Cortesian

A.—A Spanish *conquistador* of the beginning of the sixteenth century, riding on a horse (designed here by a hand probably used to painting only deer) is attacking, sword in hand, a Mexican Indian. Such a group by the year 1 *acatl* (1519), the very year of the arrival and first attacks of Cortes, can only be the expression of the Conquest of Mexico. Nothing justifies the importance here given to Tetlapulco, a village no more in existence, and where no battle took place. Is the conqueror here painted, a portrait of Hernando Cortes? There can be nothing but conjecture on this particular point.

B.—It is certain that the famous Franciscan cross was first erected in 1526 when the missionaries moved from their little chapel (at the corner of what is now Argentina and Guatemala streets) to the site of their new church of San Francisco. The new possessor of the Codex believed (and he was right) that such an important fact ought to be recorded. But he was not familiar with the old Aztec way

of recording nor with the Spanish way either. So in a very childish but typical Indian fashion he expressed his date with the few figures he happened to know: (4+4+4+4+4+4+2=26). This probable explanation is confirmed by the similar method used to record the foundation of the town of San Marcos (4+4+4+4+4+4+4+4=32).

C.—The painting of the holy Evangelist with his symbolic lion, would not be of itself the sign of a town. But the *marques* crown on top of the Saint, has no meaning unless it refers to the Marquis of Salinas to whom this very town (some twenty miles north of the City of Mexico) had to pay annual tribute, as we know from the "Annales Franciscanos." The only reason we find for including the San Marcos foundation among the main events of the country, is that such a town was of great importance—for the painter.

D.—A virgin with her hands folded near her heart, her head bent towards her right shoulder, dressed in a salmon colored tunic and a greenish blue mantilla (see the unique design as in the original) is the Virgin of Guadalupe as venerated in Tepeyac, four miles north of the City of Mexico, and some six miles south of San Marcos. By painting it a little lower than the year 1532 it is well indicated that her year was 1531.

E.—The bell seen as a part of the lost portion of the Codex is not of sufficient moment to warrant any serious consideration.

The Age of the Codex

The Codex Saville is especially important on account of its extraordinary antiquity among the historical Codices of America. At first glance, any expert archeologist would refer the pre-Cortesian part of the Codex to the middle of the fifteenth century. A closer analysis leads us to the same conclusion for several good reasons:

1. Its paper is of the most primitive and rough material. There is nothing on it like the coating used by all the *tecuilos* of the end of the fifteenth century to smooth the surface and make it ready for painting.

2. The designs are genuinely simple, very different from those colorful and standardized gods and warriors so much in vogue in the time of Athuitzotl 1486. The pre-Hispanic part, the only one we are referring to now, was designed with deep black vegetable ink. The colors are of that much later date when the *Tecuilo* had lost even the notion that the *colpilli* or royal crowns were golden instead of blue.
3. Another sign of antiquity is the absence of more progressive writing. The oldest kind of script is called figurative. Its meaning is simply the painted design. At most it uses some natural sign, like foot prints for human walking. The second kind is called ideographic which expresses abstract ideas or verbs, as, for instance, a conventional curve line before the lips meaning to ask and another one to answer. The third kind of script, called phonetic, paints two or more things whose names if articulated sound like the name of a very different object. The last two ways of writing are not used at all in this Codex because they are of later invention. The Codex therefore is much older than the end of the fifteenth century.
4. The system of dating in our Codex is the same substantially as the one used by the other historical Codices, but it is handled in a very awkward way. It only gives you the initial sign for every *tlalpilli* (period of thirteen years) leaving you the task of counting when you try to find a year. Now the need for improvements in chronology, as well as in any other human invention, is a natural proof of antiquity just as an oil lamp must be much older than an electric light.
5. We can go still further to a more certain and definite statement: The Codex was started before the year 1454 A. D. It is admitted by first-class historians that the "Feast of the Sacred Fire" which according to civil and religious law was to be celebrated at the end of the cycle, namely: in the year 13 houses (1453) was transferred, owing to the necessary correction of the calendar, to the first morning of 2 reeds (1455). Now the original writer when making his paradigm or frame of the vertical dating line with its

circles, signs and symbols, painted the symbol of the cycle just in front of 1453.

When, later on, he knew of the correction of the calendar (that news must have been given some time before the end of 1453) he had to correct his time line as he did, by painting the said symbol in 1455 and pasting a small piece of paper on top of the old one.[4] If he had to correct the mistake he made in 1453, he certainly made the mistake and did the painting in or before 1453. It is hard to tell how long before 1454 the Codex was in existence. From the details though, of the Itzcoatl period, which seem to be taken from personal impressions of the *tecuilo* one feels inclined to believe that he began to write some time around 1440. After we have reached this conclusion it is quite natural to ask: "Do you think this is the oldest book in America?" It is hard to tell; but if we take the word "book" in its formal sense, I think we can give an affirmative answer.

Thus limiting the question, we should not confront the Codex Saville with the hieratic codices. No matter what their shapes are, formally speaking, they are no more books than a calendar or an iconostatos.[5] The maps (never books) of the "immigration period," because of their lack of coordination and utter unreliableness, are also out of question.[6] The *estampas* intended only to show the types or costumes, the lives and customs of some races in abstract, are not to be called codices.[7]

---

[4]Orozco y Berra. "Historia antigua y de la Conquista de Mexico," Vol. II, pp. 44, 45, 90, maintains that the correction took place in 1299. He tries to prove his statement by quoting the Tellerian and Vatican Codices, but the fact is that they do not show the original sign of the correction for that remote year. Perfect reproductions of them are in all good libraries.

[5]Such are the Codices "Colombino," "Peresian," "Cospian," "Vatican 3738," "Bourbon," "Becker," "Berlin," "Magiebechiano" and even the great "Codex Nuttal" and the "Vindobonensis," although they contain some historical data.

[6]"Lamina Chavero," "Mapa Boturini," "Mapa Sigüenga," "Codice Porfirio Diaz" (otherwise, may be, a fake) "Codice Dehesa."

[7]"Cozcatzin," "Toltzin," "Xolotl," "Quinantzin," "Fernandez Leal" etc. There are also to be excluded thousands of legal painted papers on private affairs, like the "Vergara," "Cempoala," "Duque de Osuna," and "Cuevas" so called codices.

Although very valuable, original and historical codices, the "Lienzo de Tlaxcala," the "Martinez Gracida," and "Xucutácato," judged by their very make and by most of their contents, belong to the post-Cortesian period.

The venerable codices "Mendocino," "Vatican 3738," "Telleriano-Rhemensis," and "Historia en Lengua Mexicana" were certainly taken from documents older than the Codex Saville but as a matter of fact the originals were lost. Those valuable codices are only copies on European paper and later than 1519, all of them.

The precious "Tira de Tepechpan" is painted on native agave paper, but it brings the cycle sign on "2 acatl" (1455) with no visible correction (like the Codex Saville) in the preceding years. It is therefore at least one year later than the Codex Saville. Then the more improved way of dating used by the "Tepechpan", its white adhesive coating, the employing of improved conventional signs, and the great variety of colors and artistic designs are in our opinion so many confirmations.

The "Codex Cuahutitlan" or *"en Croix"* has the cycle symbol in the wrong place (1454) without any correction. The writer of this Codex must have started it after the time in which such a mistake was almost impossible, probably at the time of the Conquest, when there was a general belief that the transfer of the Fire Feast had been made only by Moctezuma II in 1507. Again, its dating signs and general context show a more modern and progressive period than that of our Codex Saville.

Is there any other historical Mexican Codex that could claim seniority over the Codex Saville? We do not know of any; neither do three good archeologists we have consulted.

If it is the oldest Mexican historical Codex, we might easily conclude that it is the oldest book in America as nothing of the kind was ever painted by any of the native Indians of either North or South America.

BLESSED ISAAC JOGUES

Rev. Francis X. Talbot, S.J.

Paper read at the meeting of the Society, held on the evening of May 26, 1928

On June 21, 1925, was issued the decree declaring the beatification of the eight Jesuit Martyrs of North America: Isaac Jogues, John de Brébeuf, Gabriel Lalemant, Anthony Daniel, Charles Garnier, Noel Chabanal, René Goupil and John Lalande All of these were tortured and slain by the Indians in the present territory of New York and Ontario during the years from 1642 to 1649. Though they were martyred in different places and at diverse times, they were one in their zeal and their labors, they had an identical purpose and ambition, they were brothers in the same spiritual family and they were done to their bloody death by the same savage tribes. It is proper, therefore, that the Church should group them together in the honors which have now, nearly three hundred years later, been accorded them on earth, and in the glory that has assuredly been theirs in heaven. It is with confidence that we now look forward to a further pronouncement by His Holiness within a year or two according the full aureole of canonization to these first and only martyrs of the North American continent, thus far recognized as such by the Church.

Of these eight blessed martyrs, three in particular have a special interest for us of New York. Isaac Jogues, the priest, and his two devoted lay assistants, René Goupil and John Lalande, have become native to our State by their death. In a purely historical way they rank among the pioneer explorers of our brooding forests, our lakes, our rivers, our jumbled mountains. From a spiritual viewpoint, they were the first Catholic missionaries to announce Christ crucified, and to be crucified with Christ, upon our soil. The names of all three are written in blood in our history, and when blood is the ink of history it cannot easily be ef-

faced. And when blood is the seed that Christ sows, there cannot but be an abundant harvest in the Church.

The title under which this lecture was announced may seem somewhat presumptuous to some of you. "Some *New* Data About Blessed Isaac Jogues" has a brazen sound to it, especially when one considers that many scholars of high repute have devoted their lives to research on the subject of the Jesuits in North America, and most especially when one realizes that a thorough and complete investigation preceded the decree in which Isaac Jogues was declared a martyr. The title, I must confess, has caused me no little concern. But the word "new" must be taken in a relative sense. A gold coin may be considered new because it has the mint mark of 1928 upon it, or it may be mistaken for new because the glitter has not been worn from it by common use, though it was minted a half century ago; or it may not be regarded as new at all, since the gold from which the coin was stamped was formed in the earth before the sixth day of creation. If the data called "new" this evening, were truly or wholly new, it would be wholly false.

The first source of biographical material about Isaac Jogues was that written shortly after his death by Father James Buteux, a fellow-missioner with Jogues along the St. Lawrence, and his best friend and spiritual director. This memoir was dated 1652, and a manuscript copy of it, of that date, is to be found in the archives of St. Mary's College, Montreal. Eleven years after Jogues' death, in 1657, Phillip Alegambe included a biography of Jogues in his large tome, "Mortes Illustres." He used the Buteux material but added some fresh data from the correspondence that is known as "The Jesuit Relations." From 1657 to 1792, many histories of Canada and a great number of biographical sketches of Jogues were written in French, and Latin and Italian and Spanish: by Creuxius in 1664; by Matthew Tanner in 1675; by Charlevoix, a century later, in 1774. But it may be said, with all due reverence and with the highest respect to their work, that they depended solely and entirely on Buteux and Alegambe for their material. These biographers, moreover, concerned themselves almost exclusively with the missionary career of Jogues, and with those elements which portray the sanctity of their subject.

In 1792, a new source of material was offered by Jean Baptist Pierre Forest. Like Jogues, Forest was a native of Orleans. Like him, again, he was a Jesuit, until the time of the Suppression of the Society. He was inspired by civic pride to pen the life of his townsman and fellow Jesuit, and with that purpose in view he diligently collected material on a neglected portion of Jogues' career, namely his family and home life, and early years. The manuscript was finished about 1792, and it has remained in manuscript ever since. For in 1792, the cyclone of the Revolution whirled through France, and in the diabolical years that followed there was no place for a life of a saint.

For nearly a century following, interest in Jogues lagged. The greatest credit for the revival must be given to Felix Martin, S.J., who wrote the first exhaustive life of Isaac Jogues in 1874. This was translated into English by John Gilmary Shea in 1885, and has remained the authoritative work on Jogues till the present time. Father Martin used the two sources already indicated: that of the "Jesuit Relations," Buteaux's memoirs and Alegambe's redaction; and that of Forest's manuscript.

Since the publication of Father Martin's life, the story of Jogues has been often told. And a considerable amount of research has been carried on by Fathers Arthur Jones, E. J. Devine, and Arthur Melançon in Canada; by John Gilmary Shea and Dr. E. B. O'Callaghan, by Father Thomas J. Campbell and Father John J. Wynne in the United States. Scholars such as these have clarified many issues, have located lost places, and have rewritten the story in a popular style. Despite all the splendid research, however, there remain many questions which have not been answered to the satisfaction of inquisitive and curious students of Jogues' life.

The thirty-nine years of Jogues life fall naturally into six periods. The first is the longest and the least important. It comprises the years 1607 to 1624, that is from his birth to his entrance into the Society of Jesus. The second period, from 1624 till his departure for New France in 1636, is notable only in this, that it gave him the Jesuit training which prepared him for the hard years that were to come to him. The third period was passed in the Huron cabins on Georgian Bay, off Lake Huron,

from 1636 to 1642. In the summer of 1642, Jogues entered a new door in life when he was captured by the Mohawk Iroquois and remained with them for a full year. He returned to France, and the three months he spent there, from Christmas Day, 1643, till March, are quite important enough to be regarded as the fifth period of his life. Jogues was far more anxious to escape from the powdered French than he was from the painted Iroquois, and so in 1644 he sailed out of La Rochelle to enter upon the final and the climactic period of his life in New France.

In a survey of the life of Jogues, such as this paper is intended to be, one is impressed by the fact that there is an abundance of authentic biographical material on Jogues' life in New France, but a great lack of data about his life in Old France. Or to put it in terms of time, the last ten years of his life, with the exception of the three months spent in France, are minutely recorded, but the preceding thirty years are comparatively unknown. It is a temptation to any biographer, or lecturer, then, to draw glamorous pictures of these better known years of Jogues' life; the bubbling enthusiasm of the young missioner as his white-winged bark glided silently, save for the swish of the waves, out of the roadway of Dieppe; the pounding of his heart as his gallant ship bucked the current of the St. Lawrence and anchored under the black cliffs of Quebec; the amazement with which his fascinated eyes looked for the first time on the Hurons and the Algonquins, their red bodies naked and glistening with oil, their faces streaked with grotesque yellow and scarlet and blue and green and white paint; the thrill that coursed through him when he first offered the Holy Sacrifice upon this unknown and fearsome land; the awe with which he peeped behind the curtain of the shaggy forest that was all about him, that lonesome, terrifying, silent forest through which savage forms glided as noiselessly as ghosts.

One is tempted, I repeat, to speak of journeys by canoe up the St. Lawrence and up the Ottawa, past cascades and overhanging rocks, of life in the vermin and the smoke infested cabins, of sentences and threats of death that hung over him all during the dreadful epidemics of influenza and small-pox, of nights when there could be promised no dawnings, of days when the tomahawk

would have been most welcome, of journeys to the South when no one dared to give him shelter from the snow and winds, and of journeys to the West such as that when Jogues and Raymbault stood, the very first of all white men, upon the shores of Lake Superior. The life of Jogues is tense with crowding moments of drama, it is gorgeous with ribbons of romance. But the story of Jogues and New France has been told often and told well. It is my humble concern at first, to speak a little about a portion of Jogues life that is not well known, the dull and stupid years of babyhood and boyhood.

As preface, and by way of justification, I think it well to note that Father Martin, in his life of Jogues, devotes but seven lines to the narration of the first ten years of Jogues; he emphasizes these sparse facts by some fifteen lines of spiritual comment. The thought has occured that a greater knowledge of the first ten years of Jogues' life is tremendously important for a full understanding of the historic last ten years. But in regard to all the years, from 1607, when Jogues was born, till 1624, when he became a Jesuit novice, the biographers are strangely silent and reserved.

Of Jogues' ancestry, Alegambe remarks only that he came of "honest and pious parents." Forest was more interested in the Jogues family and supplies a few more details, but subsequent biographers have not followed his lead nor have they availed themselves of the clues he furnishes. As an indication of what might be done, I submit the few following details, patched together from diverse references, scarcely any of which have ever been included in a printed biography of Jogues.

Isaac Jogues was the son of Laurent Jogues and of Françoise de Saint Mesmin, or Menin, or Minin, for the name occurs in euphonic spelling. Laurent Jogues was the son of Philip Jogues and Claude Savari, married in 1566; he had at least two brothers, Francis and Isaac. He was a store-keeper, dealing I know not in what commodities. His store was situated, (if one may deduce anything from the address on a letter written by Isaac Jogues and wholly disregarded by biographers) near the Grand Marché and facing La Rose, an ancient gateway and tower that stood probably in the time of Joan of Arc.

Orleans was then, in the first years of the seventeenth century. one of the commercial centers of France. It held the key position to the valley of the Loire and many roads converged into the city bringing to it brisk trade and ready wealth. Laurent, the merchant, with his store situated near the Grand Market, prospered, became one of the leading burghers of the city, and raised himself by personal merits to several important offices open to the bourgeoisie.

Isaac's father was twice married. There is no record available as to who the first wife may have been. The information is relatively unimportant save as a confirmation of a conclusion that I should like to draw later. Isaac's mother, the second wife, was the daughter of François de Saint Mesmin, Sieur de la Bressière and of a certain Michelle, who derived from some higher branch of the lower nobility but whose status I have not been able to discover. There are traces of Isaac's maternal ancestry in the records of the office holders of Orleans. Thus, in 1315, a century before Joan of Arc's delivery of Orleans, an Etienne de Saint Mesmin was a garde de la prevote (Marshall of the town), and a century after Joan, in 1523, François de Saint Mesmin is listed as knight, licentiate in law, a Councillor of the King in his Grand Council, and so forth. This was undoubtedly the great-great-grandfather of Isaac. Referring again to this ancient "Who's Who," one finds there in 1563, the name of Nicholas, also a knight, and master of the waterways and forests; most probably he was Jogues' great-grandfather. Of Jogues' grandfather, nothing is available, save the name and title.

Such details as these, clipped from the family trees, may be in themselves useless foliage. But they are indicative of the kind of blood that flowed through the veins of the future martyr, and of the mixed heritage that was his. Social distinctions of rank were closely drawn before the times of Henry IV. But after Henry had settled the religious wars and soothed the lower classes by his economic and agricultural program, the lower strata of the aristocracy, now that wars and pillage were not remunerative, grew penurious; by contrast, the upper strata of the bourgeoisie, which flourishes in times of peace, plied its trade and became wealthy. As a result, the tradespeople educated their sons as

doctors and lawyers, they detached themselves from the peasants and the then laboring people, made their voices heard in the States General, as in 1614, they mingled with the lower nobility, and through their wealth contracted marriage alliances with the daughters of the poorer houses. There is every reason to believe that it was from such a union of a wealthy tradesman like Laurent Jogues, and the young daughter of the Squire of La Bressière that Isaac Jogues was born.

In a letter addressed by Jogues to his mother in 1636, he begs, "Present my most humble respects to my brothers and sisters." According to Forest's manuscript, Jogues' "numerous family" attended his first Mass. There are no records of the number of children born to Jogues' father by his first marriage. But there were six or seven by his second wife, and of these, Isaac was apparently the third. Only two are mentioned, by Jogues, or appear in his life; Samuel, who became a Capuchin and who was probably older than Isaac, and Phillip, who was younger, and to whose marriage Isaac was invited in 1635 (or the end of 1634). It was from this brother Phillip that the Jogues family continued its eminence in Orleans, was accepted among the nobility as the Jogues de Guédreville, and has present day descendants under the name of de Dreuzy.

The name of Isaac, which was given to him at his baptism almost immediately after his birth, offers an illustration of the manner in which the biography of Jogues' has been written. Almost from the first, the pious biographer discovered the prophetic significance of the name, interpreting it as a presage of the sacrifice his dear mother would be called on to make and also of the sacrifice of his own life which would be demanded of him. But though the name was prophetic for the future martyr, it had no such significance for the martyr's uncle, or for his nephew or for his grand nephew, all of whom were Isaacs and who married and died in peace.

But the name has another significance, in that it has a Calvinistic sound. From 1540 to 1560, the disciples of Calvin attracted many converts to the new doctrine throughout France. Orleans was one of the Protestant centers in the kingdom, and when the religious wars broke out in 1562 the city was taken and retaken

by the Huguenot and the Catholic parties. Bitter feelings existed in Orleans even after the religious wars were terminated by the Edict of Nantes in 1598. Whether Calvinism ever actually entered into the Jogues family has not been recorded, but there is an evident Calvinistic influence in the fact that Isaac should have been a Jogues family name, for the Calvinists dearly loved to call their children Joshua and David and Shadrach and Solomon and Isaac. Still, Isaac is a Catholic name. Holweck lists some forty-eight Saints, or supposed Saints, who bear this name.

For a complete and exhaustive biography of Isaac Jogues, it seems most important that further aspects of his early life must be sought out from direct and indirect sources. This period has been strangely neglected by even the most exhaustive research-workers. Father Martin skips from the baptism of Jogues in 1607 to his entrance into the Jesuit college at Orleans in 1617, and from 1617 to his admission into the Society of Jesus in 1624, without offering any factual evidence for the intervening years, And yet, a full chapter of details could be collected, details illustrative of the home life that seriously affected Jogues' character, illustrative of the educational system in which he was formed, of the social conditions, and the like. But to continue, at this time any further investigation into this neglected portion of the life of Jogues would be taking advantage of the patience of this audience. Those of us who are interested in Isaac Jogues have a thousand varied questions to ask about him, and very few of them, probably can ever be answered. It would be gratifying, for example, to discover some clue as to what Jogues really looked like, to know exactly what manner of man he was physically.

After all, these matters are relatively unimportant when compared with those episodes about which we know so minutely and which are far more interesting to the citizens of this State. And it is most gratifying to note that the details of these episodes have been drafted by his own hand. Through this record we can follow his every step in New York, as though we followed him in Indian file.

In 1642, he first entered New York territory, as a captive of the Mohawks. His entry was through the Richelieu River that links the St. Lawrence with Lake Champlain. He was tortured

on the west bank of the Richelieu and again on an island in the lower reaches of Lake Champlain. He was dragged across the portage into what is now called Lake George, but which he named the Lake of the Blessed Sacrament. He was undoubtedly the first white man to venture on its fretful surface. From the rounded cup of the south bank of Lake George, he treaded the forest paths across the hills to the Mohawk villages along the south bank of the Mohawk River. The waters of the lakes and the grasses of the woods were reddened by his blood all along his route. And the three hilltops above the Mohawk River, whereon were perched the three Mohawk hamlets, were made holy by the tortures that even yet send a shudder of horror through one that merely reads of them.

Isaac Jogues is undoubtedly one of the great pioneer explorers of New York, even as he is the greatest saint to which New York may lay claim. For from August of 1642 to the August of the following year, Jogues penetrated to sections of the State where no white man had ever before ventured. He was carried as a trophy of victory to distant tribes by Mohawk embassies; he accompanied his masters when they hunted in the Adirondacks and the Catskills, and he attended them on their fishing trips to the upper portions of the Hudson and to the lakes around Saratoga.

From his Indian cabin overlooking the Mohawk valley, Jogues tramped the narrow trail worn deep by Indian moccasins that lead down the forty-odd miles to the Dutch settlement at Fort Orange, now Albany. The first settlers under the Dutch patroon, Van Rensselaer, had made their earliest landing just a baker's dozen of years before Jogues' arrival. There were not above a hundred whites in the Albany of those days, and only about twenty-five or thirty log cabins. In one of these, Jogues lay concealed for a month and a half until a Dutch sloop carried him down the Hudson. It was the first week of October, and our river must have been ablaze with all the glory of a red and golden Autumn. Half way down the river, the sloop anchored off a little island, now named Esopus, a few miles north of the Jesuit Novitiate at Poughkeepsie. With a bottle of good wine and amid the lusty shouts of the full-chested crew, the Reverend Dominie Megapolensis christened the whale-back rock Jogues' Island.

Like every good American, Isaac Jogues finally arrived on the Island of Manhattan. Like every notable visitor to Manhattan, he was dined and feted in the traditional manner. And like every intelligent traveler, Jogues wrote a book about his impressions of Manhattan and its people. The original manuscript, dated 1646, is preserved at St. Mary's College, Montreal. The edges are a bit frayed, the paper is brittle after three hundred years, but the ink is black and the pen-strokes firm and strong.

The Manhattan which Jogues described in 1643, some thirty years after its settlement, had some of the same traits and ailments that it has today. True, the island was as sparsely habitable as the outside scale of an artichoke is edible. The houses clustered only about the tip of the island, only in the space covered by the buildings a few blocks north of Battery Park, for Battery Park had not then had its face lifted above the surface of the Bay. Even thus, at a time when Wall Street was but a muddy footpath in the suburbs, Jogues reports that commerce was lively and the Manhattanites were shrewd traders. The entire population of the city was then about 4,500. But Jogues records, on the authority of the governor, William Kieft, that eighteen different languages were spoken here. He mentions three acquaintances specifically, and they are indicative of the fact that Manhattan has not changed. One of these was a Protestant Pole, who expressed his enthusiasm by gestures. Another was a Portuguese woman who had pictures of the Blessed Virgin and Saint Aloysius hung over her chimney-place. And the third was a young Irishman, whose first thought when he heard that a priest had come to town, was to go to Confession.

There would be a local interest for us to follow the sparse little emaciated figure of Jogues, decked out in borrowed Dutch bloomers, as he walked forth from the home of his host, Dominie Magapolensis, on what is the present Morris Street, off lower Broadway, where the Cunard Building now stands, and wandered along the canal on Broad street or looked upon the houses that even then showed traces of the Babylonian style of architecture that Manhattan now favors, or examined the disrepair of the fort, which, as an expert in Indian warfare, he deplored. But the data on this portion of Jogues' life has already

been examined adequately, yes, by scholars here present, and so is beyond the scope of my purpose this evening.

But I may be permitted to make this observation, that Jogues was the first European who traversed the full length of New York State from its Northern to its Southern borders, and thus was the pioneer of that trip between New York and Montreal which is now so popular.

Jogues made a second and a third journey into New York, the former when he returned to his Mohawks as an ambassador to draft a treaty of peace, and the latter when he came as a missionary, with high hopes of gathering a congregation and of building the first Catholic church in New York. But the hoped-for neophytes, when he met them, had smeared the scarlet and white paint over their faces and their bodies, and that meant war. And thus it came about that our pioneer New York priest was made a martyr of Christ, that on a mellow October evening as the sun was hanging low over the Mohawk valley, his skull was crushed by a stone tomahawk, his sacred remains were tossed into the river, and his head was fitted upon a pointed beam above the gate of the palisades. Under the green lawns of that hill-top near Auriesville, the skull of the martyrs Jogues and Lalande may still be resting, as undoubtedly the bones of that other martyr, René Goupil, may still be reposing in the hiding place where Isaac Jogues laid them to rest.

Before the day, a year or two hence, when Isaac Jogues is finally declared a Saint and is truly adopted by us as our own New York Saint, an exhaustive biography should be written of him. It is to be hoped that such a life may show him as he was, and not as a future Saint was supposed to have been. Isaac Jogues was not an impressive personality such as John de Brébeuf; he was not a sagacious executive as was Jerome Lalemant; he was not the polished diplomat that Paul Le Jeune was. But in his own way he was greater than them all. He was a small man physically that carried the burdens that giant men could scarcely shoulder. He was a timid man that braved the fury of mobs who were craving to kill and actually eat him. He was frightened and his soul quaked before the command to go to certain torture and death, but he bade good bye with a smile and

poured out to God an effusive, though sincere, prayer of gratitude. He was the kind of man that would endure the torture of having his fingers chewed off without a murmur, and then try to hide the stumps, lest friends should admire his courage; a man who would not drink wines or eat delicacies during his few months' stay in France, lest he lose his taste for crushed corn and water when he went back to the wildernesses of New France. He was a man that remained virginal, even in thought, amidst the wild debauches of an Indian feast; one who was as scrupulous and devout in an Indian cabin as a Carmelite nun is in her chapel; one who did not have enough drops of blood in his veins to satisfy his desires of shedding enough blood for Christ. Jogues was a man who would not hesitate to bathe a savage putrid with small-pox; a man who never complained when burning coals were held against his body or when his finger nails were torn out; a man who had experienced the intensity of torture and who, nevertheless, gladly went back to a treacherous people to suffer more. There was but one thing, outside of sin, that Blessed Isaac Jogues would shrink from. And that would be to hear himself praised, and to show himself before such a distinguished assembly as this.

ARCHBISHOP HUGHES AND MEXICO

THOMAS F. MEEHAN

When the Sixth Provincial Council of the Hierarchy of the Church in the United States met at Baltimore in 1846, the war with Mexico was being waged. There was much indignation rife over the way in which fanatical military martinets were treating the Catholic soldiers in the army, and President Polk, Secretary of State James Buchanan and Secretary of War William L. Marcy were much disturbed over the situation. Rumors were rife during the Council that, in addition to seeking a practical plan to have Catholic chaplains sent to minister to the Catholic soldiers, the President also tried to persuade the then Bishop John Hughes of New York to go to Mexico and act for him as a peace envoy.

In 1864 when John R. G. Hassard was entrusted with the task of preparing the official life of Archbishop Hughes he wrote the Secretary of State of the Mexican war period, and later President of the United States, James Buchanan, asking him for the particulars of this episode. Mr. Hassard preserved the letter he received in answer from Ex-President Buchanan and it is included with some hundred others from distinguished persons among the effects of his widow, Mrs. Isabella Hargous Hassard, who died in New York on August 3, 1928. Her niece and executor has kindly had it copied for the Editor of RECORDS AND STUDIES. It reads:

Wheatlands, near Lancaster
8 November, 1864

My dear Sir:

I have received your favor of the 31st ultimo, inquiring whether there is any truth in the statement that President Polk in 1846, had solicited Archbishop Hughes to accept a special mission to Mexico, and I regret that I cannot give this question a very definite answer. I shall cheerfully, however, state all my knowledge on this subject.

There were, at this period, many Catholic soldiers in the Army of General Taylor on the Rio Grande: and I suggested to President Polk that it was our duty to provide them Chaplains of their own religious denomination. To this he cheerfully assented.

In consequence I addressed the letter in May 1846, to which you refer, to Bishop Hughes (not then Archbishop) inviting him to come to Washington. He was then in Baltimore, attending the Provincial Council of Catholic Bishops. He immediately visited me at the State Department accompanied by Bishop Loras of Dubuque.

When I communicated to Bishop Hughes the desire of the President to send Catholic chaplains to the army & to obtain his advice & assistance to carry this into effect, both Bishops warmly approved the measure. They immediately proceeded to the Jesuits College in Georgetown to obtain the services of two suitable army Chaplains. After a few hours they returned, evidently much gratified with their success, and informed me, in enthusiastic terms, that every professor of the College, both old and young, had volunteered to go to the army. The Bishop, however, came to the conclusion that it would be more expedient to select the chaplains from among the Jesuits outside of the college & accordingly Father McElroy & Father Rey of the Jesuit Society were appointed for the arduous & dangerous services. It is due to these pious & good men to say that they faithfully & usefully performed their spiritual duties to the soldiers, & with much satisfaction to the administration. One of them Father Rey was afterwards murdered by Brigands, near Monterey.

It occurred to the President whilst the Bishop was in Washington & most probably at an earlier period that should he consent to visit Mexico he might render essential services in removing the violent prejudices of the Mexicans, & especially of their influential Clergy which then prevailed against the United States & thus prepare the way for peace between the two Republics. In this I heartily concurred. Independently of his exalted character as a Dignitary of the Church, I believed him to be one of the ablest & most accomplished & energetic men I had ever known, & that he possessed all the prudence & firmness necessary to render such a mission successful.

The President & the Bishop had several conversations on this subject; but at none of these was I present. I have not the least doubt, however, from what I heard the President say, that this mission was offered to him & that he declined it.

The President, much as he desired to avail himself of the Bishop's services could not at that time offer him anything more acceptable. He could not appoint a new Envoy to the Mexican Government, so soon after they had refused in an insulting Manner, to receive our former Minister. Parades was at that time the Revolutionary President of Mexico. He owed his elevation to his extreme & violent hostility to the Government & people

of the United States. Beside, his Army had just commenced the war by crossing the Rio Grande & attacking a detachment of our troops.

Yours very respectfully,

JAMES BUCHANAN.

Mr. John R. G. Hassard.

Nothing further came of the suggested peace mission. Bishop Hughes would never discuss the details of his conferences with President Polk. He held them as strictly confidential.

The law did not then authorize the President to appoint and commission chaplains, but by virtue of his discretionary power he used his authority to employ and attach to the army "persons to perform such duties as appertain to chaplains," as Secretary of War Marcy stated in his letters of instruction to Father McElroy, General Zachary Taylor, and the other officers of the army. The pay of these chaplains was $100 a month and traveling expenses to and from the front. The action of President Polk, in regard to these Catholic chaplains, evoked a storm of vituperation from a number of fanatical Know-Nothing preachers, especially in Philadelphia, and, in his "Diary,"* he expresses his profound contempt for these bigots, who were of the same kind as their imitators of the present day.

In Volume I of this "Diary," on pages 408, 409, and 411, recording Tuesday, May 19, 1846 Mr. Polk says:

"Mr. Buchanan called whilst some of the members of the Cabinet were still in my office and introduced Bishop Hughes of the Catholic Church in New York. I requested Bishop Hughes to call with Mr. Buchanan at 7 P. M. Bishop Hughes had come to Washington upon an invitation given by Mr. Buchanan upon consultation with me some days ago. Our object was to procure his aid in disabusing the minds of the Catholic Priests and people of Mexico in regard to what they most erroneously supposed to be the hostile design of the government and people of the U. S. upon the religion and church property of Mexico.

"Bishop Hughes called with Mr. Buchanan at 7 o'clock. Mr. B. having already conversed with him on the subject, retired, and

*The Diary of James K. Polk during his Presidency, 1845 to 1849." Ed. Milo Milton Quaiffe, 4 vols. Chicago, 1910.

I held conversation of an hour with him. I fully explained to him the objections which we would probably have to encounter from the prejudices of the Catholic Priests of Mexico, and the false impressions they had of the hostile designs of this country on their religion; the false idea had been industriously circulated by interested partizans in Mexico that our object was to overthrow their religion and rob their churches, and that if they believed this they would make a desperate resistance to our army in the present war. Bishop Hughes fully agreed with me in the opinion I expressed that it was important to remove such impressions. I said to him that the great object of my desiring to have this interview with him was to ask whether some of the Priests of the U. S., who spoke the Spanish language, could be induced to accompany our army as chaplains and others to visit Mexico in advance of the army, for the purpose of giving assurance to the Catholic clergy in Mexico that under our constitution their religion and church property would be secure and that so far from being violated, both would be protected by our army and in this way avoid their active hostility in the pending war. Bishop Hughes at once said he thought such a visit to Mexico and having a few Catholic priests with the army would have a good effect, and expressed his entire willingness to cooperate with our government in giving such aid as was in his power. He said he knew personally the Arch-bishop of Mexico, & expressed his willingness to visit Mexico himself if the government desired it. I found Bishop Hughes a highly intelligent and agreeable man and my interview with him was of the most satisfactory character."

Further reference to Bishop Hughes is made under the date of May 20, 1846:

"Col. Benton called with the Catholic Bishop of Missouri. I had before held a conversation with Col. B. and he has concurred with me in the importance of having with our army in Mexico a few Catholic Priests, who would be able to allay the fears of the Mexican Catholics in regard to their religion and church property. I had a short conversation with Col. B. and the Bishop. Col. B. said they had just seen the Secretary of War, and that a number of Priests would be designated by the Bishop to accompany the army. If the Catholic Priests in Mexico can be satisfied that their churches and religion would be secure the

conquest of the Northern Provinces of Mexico will be easy and the probability is that the war would be of short duration; but if a contrary opinion prevailed the resistance to our forces will be desperate. The interview with Bishop Hughes on yesterday, and this interview with the Bishop of Missouri today was for the purpose of having their aid in conveying true information in relation to the free toleration of all sects of religion under our constitution to the Mexican Priesthood and people, and giving them assurance that our invasion of Mexico was not for the purpose of interfering in any way with their religion."

In Volume II under date of October 14, 1846, pages 187, 188, 190 and 191 the "Diary" continues:

"I was occupied for more than an hour by the Rev'd Wm. L. McCalla of the Presbyterian Church and brother of the 2nd Auditor of the Treasury. His ostensible object was to be appointed a Chaplain in the army. I found him to be a fanatic, proscriptive in his religious opinions and most unreasonable. He read to me a number of letters addressed to me (but which he did not deliver to me) from persons in Philadelphia, and among others from Mr. Dallas, Judge Kane, and Mr. Leifer giving him a good character and recommending him for a chaplaincy. He read also a most intemperate and violent petition which had been written and signed in a blank book purporting to be addressed to me, but which he did not offer to deliver to me. His petition was a violent and most intolerant attack on the Roman Catholics and a censure of the administration for employing as it represented, two or three Roman Catholic Priests with the army in Mexico as chaplains. The prominent idea, aside from its abuse of Catholics and its fanaticism, was that unless I appointed the Rev'd Mr. McCalla, a chaplain, the petitioners intended to go before the public and attack the administration upon religious grounds because of the employment of these Catholic Priests. I felt great contempt for Mr. McCalla and for his religion and gave him my mind freely. I told him that thank God under our constitution there was no connection between Church and State, and that in my action as President of the U. S., I recognized no distinction of creeds in my appointments to office. I told him that his petition was false, and that before he had written it and caused it to be signed he ought, as a man of God as he professed to be,

to have ascertained the facts better. He attempted to explain the petition and denied that it was not susceptible of the explanation which he gave. I then stated to him how it happened that two or three Catholic Priests had been employed with the army. I told him it was known that Mexico was a Catholic country that their Priests had great influence over that ignorant people and that they would probably deceive them by representing that the U. S. was waging war against them to overturn their religion and that if they succeeded in imposing such a falsehood as this upon the people of Mexico they would infuriate them and induce them to carry on a desperate and most sanguinary war against our army, and that to undeceive the Mexicans two or three Catholic Priests who spoke their language it was thought would be useful with the army. I told him that these were the reasons and these alone which induced their employment. I told him that Col. Benton and other members of Congress who were well acquainted with the Mexican people had advised their employment for these reasons. I told him that they were not Chaplains, that there was no law authorizing the appointment of Chaplains for the army, but that they were employees such as armies often require who had been sent out for the purposes stated. I told him further, that in the Navy where the Chaplains were authorized by law, I had appointed several since I came into office without regard to the sects of religion to which they belonged, and that I had appointed no Catholic Priests. He intimated that he wished to have an appointment of Chaplain in the Navy. . . . I would not resist the conclusion that one of two things were true; either that Mr. McCalla expected to alarm me into his appointment to avoid an attack before the public from him, or that he hoped to be refused so as to give him a pretext to make such attack. If either were true I had great contempt for him and I gave him distinctly to understand that I would not appoint him. . . . He denied any intention to attack the administration. I consider him either a knave without vital religion or a fanatic without reason. I have met with no man during my administration, among the numerous office-seekers who have beset me for whom I have so profound a contempt. To attempt to connect me with religious feuds between sects, either for the purpose of coercing me to give him an office or to give him a pretext to at-

tack me upon affectual or pretended religious grounds if I did not, proves him to be a man destitute of both religion and principle. . . . I have a great veneration and regard for religion and sincere piety, but a hypocrite or a bigoted fanatic without reason I cannot bear. Whether he be the one or the other, his God alone is competent to judge. He has not succeeded in getting the office and I shall not be surprised to be assailed and slandered by him in the newspapers."

The topic comes up again in the notes of a Cabinet meeting given in Vol. III, dated July 29, 1847, on pages 103, 104 and 105:

"The subject of the publication of a letter of the Rev. Wm. McCalla in the newspapers relative to the employment of two Catholic Priests to attend the army was one of conversation. The letter of Mr. McCalla contains a positive and absolute falsehood, to wit, that in conversation with him I had informed him that I had sent them to the army nominally as Chaplains but really as spies. It was stated that the letter was attracting much public attention, would likely provide some excitement and the question was whether the falsehood should not be contradicted in the newspapers. Upon this point there was doubt. The statement made by Mr. McCalla I knew to be false, but whether the President of the U. S. could with propriety enter into a controversy with him upon a point necessarily involving a question of veracity was very questionable. I sent for the Secretary of State who thought no notice should be taken of it, but if there was, it should be a very positive but short denial of his statement by the Editors of the *Union*. The matter was finally left open and undecided. The conduct of Mr. McCalla in this matter is of the basest character. He called on me some time ago and applied to me to appoint him a Chaplain in the army. I had not before known him and treated him as I do all persons who call on me courteously. I told him I could not gratify his wishes. He wished to know why I had appointed two Catholic clergymen to attend the army in the character of Chaplains. I told him that by law I had no power to appoint and commission chaplains, but that there were always many employes in an army, such as teamsters, laborers, bearers of despatches, couriers to bear and bring back information, etc. I informed him that early after the war with Mexico broke out, great efforts had been made to impress the Mexicans with the

belief that our object was to destroy their churches and make war upon their religion; that if this false impression should prevail generally among the Mexicans it would make the war one of ferocity and fanaticism. I told him that for the purpose of satisfying the Mexican people that such was no part of the object of the War, it was deemed prudent to employ these Catholic Priests who professed the same religion with the Mexicans, to accompany the army that they might disabuse their minds on this subject and thereby not only mitigate the horrors of the war, but facilitate peace. Mr. McCalla manifested in the conversation much excitement and a spirit of persecution and religious fanaticism against the Catholics. Indeed he seemed occasionally to speak like a deranged man on the subject. He left my office having failed to get the office which he called to seek and after the lapse of several weeks had the baseness to state this falsehood in answer to a letter of P. A. Brown, a leading Native American of Phila. and his letter is published in the newspapers. I cannot adequately express the horror I feel for a man who can be so base as to veil his hypocracy under the cloak of religion and state the base falsehood he has done. If I were a private citizen I should have no hesitation in exposing him to the world, but it is doubtful whether, as President of the U. S. I should descend from my station to notice him at all, His object is to produce a religious controversy in the country. He is a Whig and a religious fanatic, and from his publication it is clear to my mind that he is unprincipled."

The story of the Catholic chaplains and of the Catholic soldiers in the United States service during the war with Mexico was further treated in Records and Studies, Vol. XII, (June, 1918) pp. 39-65.

JAMES SHIELDS, SOLDIER, JUSTICE, SENATOR

JOHN G. COYLE, M.D.

Few men in the United States have had a more varied and striking career than James Shields, who was teacher, lawyer, State Assemblyman, State Auditor, Justice of the Supreme Court of Illinois, Commissioner of the General Land Office of the United States, General in the Mexican War, Territorial Governor of Oregon, United States Senator from Illinois, United States Senator from Minnesota, General in the Civil War, State Legislator of Missouri, Railroad Commissioner of that State, and at the time of his death United States Senator from Missouri. He is the only man who has represented three States in the Senate of the Congress of the United States.

He was born in Dungannon, County Tyrone, Ireland, on December 12, 1810. His family were poor Catholics, who suffered like many others from the religious hostility in that part of the country deeply tainted with Orangeism. The boy was fortunate in being permitted to attend a private school, the principal support of which was a wealthy non-Catholic. This man's son attended the school, and a quarrel between them resulted in the dismissal of Shields from the school. He was then taught in haphazard fashion by an uncle, who had served in the United States in the War with Great Britain, and by others. The boy learned quickly. He was high-spirited and prompt to declare his opinions. Listening to a veteran relating incidents of the Napoleonic wars, to some youthful hearers, Shields challenged the truth of some of the statements. In the altercation, the boy called the veteran a liar. True to the code of that time, the veteran challenged the boy to a duel, and they actually met on the field. The pistols used were defective, and after three attempts to discharge them, the duel was abandoned. The boy's courage won the admiration of the ex-soldier. The two became fast friends and the veteran taught the youth the rudiments of the French language he had learned during his campaigns.

The possibilities of the United States of America filled the mind of young Shields with many hopes. He set out for America on a sailing ship in 1826. The ship was wrecked on the coast of Scotland, and all on board excepting Shields, the captain, and another man were lost. Shields was washed ashore and found by a resident of the coast, who restored him to consciousness and nursed him back to health. It was some weeks before the boy was able to leave the house of his benefactor. During his stay there, he taught the newly-acquired French vocabulary to the family of his rescuer. The two other survivors of the wreck were then hunted up and he joined them, he and the captain becoming fast friends. Young Shields made several voyages to the West Indies with this captain. While returning from one of these trips, he fell from aloft, breaking both legs. The captain at New York placed the injured lad in a hospital and returned to his vessel. The friends never met again. When the sturdy lad recovered the complete use of his legs, he determined to remain in America. He made his way West, settled in Kaskaskia, Illinois, then the capital of the State. Here he taught school and studied law, and in 1832, when but twenty-two years of age, was admitted to the bar. There is another version which makes him land at New Orleans uninjured.

He was elected a member of the General Assembly of Illinois in 1836. Among those who served with him in the legislature were Stephen A. Douglas, afterward Justice and United States Senator; David Dudley Field, famous constitutional lawyer; Abraham Lincoln, afterward Representative in Congress and President; John A. McClernand, afterward General in the Civil War, and other men of national fame. Shields in 1839 became State Auditor. Shields and Douglas were Democrats, and opposed to Lincoln. Taxes due to the State had to be paid through the office of the Auditor. There was a serious financial situation existing at that time, as banks then controlled by individuals or by groups, operating under State laws, were failing here and there. Auditor Shields, to protect the State finances, ruled that moneys due to the State would not be accepted unless paid in gold or silver. This made many political and financial enemies. Abraham Lincoln was in the habit of writing letters upon political

matters in the columns of a Springfield paper, using an assumed signature and employing the vernacular of the western farmer and woodsman. Lincoln's fiancée, afterward his wife, and her sister, also wrote letters, published in the same journal, using the same signature. In one of these letters, a reference was made to Auditor Shields of such a character that he sought out the editor and demanded the name of the correspondent. It happened that the letter had been written by one of the women, and not by Lincoln. The editor told Mr. Lincoln that Shields demanded the name of the offending writer. Lincoln had not written the letter, but gallantly assumed the blame. Shields thereupon challenged Lincoln to a duel, as was the custom of the day. Lincoln did not believe in the duelling code. Being the challenged party, he had the right to name the weapons. Lincoln, accepting the challenge, sought to make the duel impossible and ridiculous by naming broadswords as the weapons and requiring that each duellist stand on his own side of a line drawn parallel with but six feet distant from the line in front of the other duellist. Should either contestant step over the line in front of him he was to be adjudged the loser of the duel.

Accounts as to the developments in consequence of this program differ. Some say no duel was held. Others say that Shields accepted, remarking grimly that if two men with swords in their hands meant business, the lines drawn on the ground would not keep them apart. But whatever was the result, it is certain that no life-long enmity persisted between the men, for later Lincoln, when President, nominated Shields for promotion as Major-General.

After his career as State Auditor, Shields was appointed to the post of Justice of the Supreme Court of Illinois, to succeed Stephen A. Douglas, who had resigned to go to the United States Senate. This was in 1843, when he was but thirty-three years old. He was elected to the office when this term expired, and continued to enjoy the honor and dignity of this high office until he resigned, to become Commissioner of the General Land Office of the United States, in 1845. His reasons for this action deserve chronicling.

The great western territories of the United States were then open to settlers upon conditions that would attract men to become

farmers. For a trifling entry fee, a man could receive through the Land Office, 160 acres of fine land, provided he would thus agree to plant the land. In Ireland thousands of families had to pay excessive rents to greedy landlords for small farms, upon which the only crop that would give sufficient returns to sustain life was potatoes. Shields had seen hardy Irishmen going to England for a few weeks' work at harvest time, and women and children, reduced to extreme poverty, working in the fields of Ireland, denied education and living in destitution. He knew that Irish families with 160 acres of land under cultivation could live comfortably, give their children a decent living, education and opportunity for advance. For the purpose of reaching the Irish families in the cities and regions where they dwelt in poor tenements, Shields, as Land Commissioner, visited the cities of the East, telling of the advantages of the free Western farms. Whenever possible, he spoke before Catholics gathered under Catholic auspices. Hundreds of families were thus induced to go from the Eastern cities to settle in Iowa and other Mid-Western States, where their descendants are prosperous citizens today. Shields was so engaged when the Mexican War broke out. President James K. Polk commissioned him, in July, 1846, a Brigadier-General.

At the battle of Cerro Gordo, April 18, 1847, Shields' brigade made a gallant assault which resulted in complete victory for the soldiers of the United States. Shields was wounded, a grape-shot passing completely through one lung and emerging from his body. Such a wound would be regarded as mortal today, despite the resources of modern surgery. Yet in less than ten weeks Shields was in the saddle. A captured Mexican surgeon of Irish birth named McMillan passed a silk handkerchief completely through Shields' body, believing it would clear the wound. The recovery of Shields made his men believe that he had a charmed life.

At Churubusco and at Chapultepec, the troops of General Shields also served gallantly. His success was such that when Mexico City was entered by the victorious American troops, General Winfield Scott, commander-in-chief, gave Shields the honor of leading the army into the captured city.

After the Mexican War, Shields was a popular idol. The State of Illinois presented him with a magnificent sword, valued at $3,000, and the State of South Carolina, one of whose regiments had served under him, with another, diamond-hilted, valued at $5,000. President Franklin Pierce appointed him Governor of the Territory of Oregon in 1848. But Shields did not hold this post long, for he was elected by the Legislature of Illinois to the post of United States Senator for the term from 1849 to 1855.

A noteworthy incident in the career of Shields as Senator from Illinois was his address in the debate upon the admission of California as a State of the Union. When the Constitution of California was under consideration, an effort was made by the Senators of some of the Southern States to put slavery into effect by making its existence and continuity a direct statement of the Constitution. Senator Shields spoke on the question of slavery and foretold its doom. He said slavery was opposed to the institutions of the country, and that the black man had the same right as the white man to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," and that the United States would have to endure as a wholly free country, were it to endure at all. His views prevailed. California came in as a free State.

When his term as Senator from Illinois expired, he removed to Minnesota, then a Territory, where he founded the town of Shieldsville and helped to build up Faribault. Minnesota made application for admission as a State of the Union in the late fifties of the nineteenth century. Already an anti-Catholic, anti-foreign political party had developed, called the Know Nothing Party, because its members took an oath to say they knew nothing about its existence, or its purposes, or other matters connected with it. When Minnesota applied for statehood, the Governor of the Territory sought to become United States Senator. He attacked Shields as a Catholic and a foreigner. The Know Nothings wished to deprive Catholics of the right to hold office and of the right to vote. They wished foreigners to be compelled to wait twenty-one years for naturalization and to be denied the right of office. This movement was at its height at the time that Minnesota was admitted as a State, but the Legislature elected James Shields and Henry M. Rice as Senators and defeated Governor

Medary, the anti-Catholic. In drawing for the choice of terms, Shields drew the short term, and served as Senator from 1858 to 1860. At the conclusion of his term of service he removed to California, and dwelt there until the outbreak of the Civil War.

When that conflict burst upon the country, Shields offered his services and was commissioned a brigadier-general by President Lincoln in August, 1861. His most noteworthy success in the war was his defeat of "Stonewall" Jackson in the battle of Winchester, March 23, 1862. Winchester lies in the Shenandoah Valley, and the Confederates were successful in holding most of that region, pushing steadily forward and hoping to strike through to Washington, by way of Harper's Ferry. Much fear was felt that this might be accomplished. Major-General N. P. Banks was in command of the United States army corps stationed in that region, and Shields in this led the division, formerly headed by General Lander. The Confederates were led by Major General Johnston, and one of the leading commanders under Johnston was General Jackson. These men had served in the war with Mexico, with Shields, and their abilities were well known to the latter.

On March 20, 1862, General Shields sought to lure Jackson into an engagement, by ordering the Union troops to fall back to Winchester so that Jackson might think they were retreating from the position they had occupied for some time. On March 22, General Jackson attacked the Union line. Shields pushed forward one brigade and two batteries to engage the enemy, but wishing to make Jackson think the Union forces were reduced in numbers, did not attack in greater strength. The Union troops, however, drove back the attacking force. Shields was struck by a fragment of a shell. His shoulder and side were injured and one arm fractured. But he kept his mind upon his task despite his wounds. He ordered a brigade under Colonel Kimball to advance three miles during the night, placed artillery where it could support Kimball, and covered the approaches to several villages. Jackson had disposed a large force near the village of Kernstown, concealing a number of men in the thick woods. On March 23, Jackson attacked. Jackson had about 11,000 and Shields about 7,000 men. The Union forces repulsed the first assault of the Confederates. The engagement spread to cover a

large area. Shields remained in touch with his commanders, and when Jackson essayed to turn the Union flank, the Union troops went forward in a splendid charge, driving the enemy back towards a stone wall, which sheltered and held them for a time. But the ardor of the Union troops, stirred by their commander, drove the Confederates backward until the retreat became a flight.

The victory heartened the Union cause greatly. Secretary of War Edwin M. Stanton telegraphed to Shields:

War Department, Washington,
March 26, 1862.

Brig.-Gen. Shields: Your two despatches relative to the brilliant achievement of the forces under your command have been received. While rejoicing at the success of your gallant troops, deep commiseration and sympathy are felt for those who have been victims in the gallant and victorious contest with treason and rebellion. Your wounds, as well as your success, prove that Lander's brave division is still bravely led, and that wherever its standard is displayed, rebels will be routed and pursued.

To you and the officers and soldiers under command, the Department returns thanks.

EDWIN M. STANTON,
Secretary of War.

General N. P. Banks issued the following general order:

Headquarters Fifth Army Corps,
Strasburg, March 26, 1862.

The Commanding General of the Fifth Army Corps congratulates the officers and soldiers of General Shields' division, and especially its gallant commander, on the auspicious and decisive victory gained over the rebels on the twenty-third inst. The division has already achieved a renown against superior forces, and a subtle and barbarous enemy.

N. P. BANKS.

Winchester.
Headquarters Gen. Shields' Division,
General Orders, No. 11.

Brig.-Gen. Shields congratulates the officers and soldiers of his division upon the glorious victory achieved by them on the twenty-third inst., near Winchester, Va. They defeated an enemy whose forces outnumbered theirs, and who were considered the bravest and best disciplined of the Confederate Army.

> He also congratulates them that it has fallen to their lot to open the campaign on the Potomac. The opening has been a splendid success. Let them inscribe "Winchester" on their banners, and prepare for other victories.
>
> BRIG.-GENERAL SHIELDS.

Governor Curtin of Pennsylvania in "General Orders, No. 20," under date of April 4, 1862, from his headquarters at Harrisburg, Pa., congratulated the numbers of the Eighty-fourth and One Hundred and Tenth Pennsylvania Volunteer Regiments upon their gallantry in the brilliant action at Winchester. He directed that "Winchester, twenty-third of March, 1862," be inscribed on the banners of those regiments.

In the account of the battle printed in the New York *World,* under date of Winchester, March 24, 1862 occurs the following:

"During the fight Gen. Shields continued to give orders as if nothing had happened, and in reply to an officer who asked, 'You are hit, General, are you not?', he said, 'Yes, I am, but say nothing of it', and he continued to issue his commands with firmness and apparent unconcern, until the severity of his wound caused faintness, and he was necessarily removed from the field.

"Four times has the General now received wounds which have endangered his life—three times in Mexico, and now again.

"The whole battle was conducted by General Shields, who issued orders from his sick-room, two miles distant, at his headquarters in Winchester."

In appreciation of this brilliant feat President Lincoln nominated him to be a Major-General of Volunteers. Such nominations require confirmation by the Senate. Strange to say, although Shields had served with distinction and honor in that body from two States, political opposition caused the confirmation to be delayed.

General Jackson was pursued by the Union troops, General John C. Fremont in charge of the pursuit. The division commanded by Shields participated. Shields assigned General Tyler to the immediate checking and pursuing of Jackson. On June, 1862, Jackson attacked Shields and compelled him to retreat. Reinforcements halted the retreat of Shields. Col. Carroll of the Eighth Ohio was sent forward to capture and burn the bridge at Port Republic, but had hardly arrived there when he was driven

back by superior numbers. Jackson swept on and reached the bridge uncaught. He crossed it safely and burned it. Fremont and Shields were foiled, for the river was unfordable.

Shields, greatly disturbed by political opposition and the refusal of the Senate to confirm his appointment as Major-General, resigned his commission in 1863. He had been tendered the command of the famous New York Irish Brigade at its formation, but he refused because he believed that Thomas Francis Meagher, who was a powerful factor in its formation, deserved the honor. He now retired to private life and resumed the practice of law in California. He had married Miss Mary Carr and they lived happily. When the Civil War ended, General Shields remained one of the foremost figures in Catholic and Irish circles in the country and he was frequently invited to speak at public assemblages.

He removed to Missouri with his growing family and located in Carrollton. Here he was elected a member of the Legislature and then was appointed Railroad Commissioner, in which post he served with ability and distinction, from 1874 to 1879. In the latter year he was again chosen United States Senator. For the third time he was thus elected by the representatives of a State, to serve in the highest legislative body of the Republic. This honor is unparalleled in the history of the Congress.

While holding the post of Senator from Missouri, Shields went to Ottumwa at the end of May, 1879, to visit his niece, Miss Mary Shields, who resided in a convent in that city. He attended early Mass on Sunday, June 1, in the convent chapel and received Holy Communion. Later, he attended High Mass. After he had retired in the evening he was seized with pains in the chest and difficulty of breathing, attacks of which had occurred at frequent intervals ever since he had received the grapeshot wound in the lung at the battle of Cerro Gordo in the Mexican War. He summoned help. His niece and Sisters of the community came. A priest was summoned and administered the last Sacraments. The Sisters gathered around the bed. The General answered the litany for the dying as long as he was able to speak, then sank into unconsciousness and died. Thus, on Sunday, in a Catholic convent, General James Shields passed away.

His remains were placed in the cemetery at Carrollton, Missouri. By Act of Congress a monument bearing a bust of the General, was unveiled there on November 12, 1910, with Archbishop John J. Glennon of St. Louis, delivering the oration.

General Shields' services have been commemorated by each of the States which he served as Senator. In the year 1893 Illinois placed in Statuary Hall of the United States Senate, as the first of the two statues permitted to each State, a bronze heroic size figure of General Shields. Governor John P. Altgeld delivered the oration. Another statue is in the city of Chicago, in the Park by the shore of Lake Michigan.

Minnesota, the second State he represented erected at its Capitol a statue of James Shields, one of its first two Senators. Archbishop John Ireland of St. Paul, himself a veteran of the Civil War, delivered the oration. The swords presented by Illinois and South Carolina to General Shields were purchased from his heirs by Act of Congress and may be seen in the historical museum of the War Department at Washington.

Posts of the Grand Army of the Republic were named for him. Many Catholic and Irish societies have taken his name as part of their titles. He was survived by his widow, who reached a ripe old age, dying in New York City in 1928, when over ninety years old. She lived with her son, Dr. Daniel F. Shields, the youngest child of the General, who had come to New York for post-graduate work and remained as a practising physician and surgeon in the Bronx. A son, named James, died in childhood. A daughter, named Katherine, was an artist of merit but died in early womanhood. The oldest son, Charles, served in the Spanish American War, and had his life shortened by reason of his experiences therein.

REFERENCES

Castle, Henry A. "General James Shields, Soldier, Orator, Statesman." Minnesota Historical Society Collections, St. Paul, Minn. Vol. 15, pages 711-730.

Ireland, John, Most Rev. Archbishop. Address at unveiling of statue of General Shields, in the Capitol of Minnesota, October 20, 1914. Minnesota Historical Society Collections, vol. 15, pages 730-740.

Ford, Patrick, in the *Irish World,* New York, June 14, 1879.

The New York *World,* June 3, 1879.

Condon, William H. "Life of Major-General James Shields." Chicago, 1900.

"Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1927." U. S. Government Printing Office, 1928.

Congressional Record, Fifty-third Congress, Second Session, Part 1, pages 58-61 and 78-82.

Congressional Globe, April 5, 1850, First Session, Part I, pages 646-650.

Interviews with Mrs. Mary Shields, widow of the General, and with Samuel A. Medary, son of Governor Medary of Minnesota.

"Records of the Rebellion," 1862.

THE CENTENARY OF AMERICAN CATHOLIC FICTION

THOMAS F. MEEHAN

The centenary of American Catholic fiction is a notable historical event, for it was in 1829 that our first Catholic novel, "Father Rowland, a North American Tale," the author of which was the Rev. Dr. Charles Constantine Pise, was published by Fielding Lucas, of Baltimore, Md. The lure of the "blurb" and the fascination of the illuminated "jacket" were not appreciated in those pioneer days, so the venture was modestly advertised by its title and the descriptive "18 mo. cloth; price .37½." That figure would relatively match the dollar of later years. Even the name of the author is not given on the title page.

It was a story with a purpose which it aptly served, and that was to offset the calumnies of a vicious anti-Catholic book, "Father Clement," one of the outcroppings of the then rising storm of Native Americanism. The same year saw the production of another volume, "Indian Cottage, a Unitarian Story," and thus Dr. Pise began a new era of Catholic American literature for, up to that time, the output had been merely books of devotion and pietistic translations. He realized the growing need of something more attractive for popular reading and started in at once to supply the lacking material, a task for which his accomplishments, versatility and industry well fitted him. Like many other reformers, he found obscurantist opposition to hamper his efforts. Gilmary Shea in his "Catholic Church in the United States," says of Dr. Pise:

"In fact, he first endeavored to give the Young Catholics of America reading which would be attractive and innocent. Like many good works, this at first found many assailants, and, borne down by the fierce criticism of Catholic reviewers, the publisher of these popular Catholic works was compelled to stop the publication. All, however, now admit the necessity of a literature of this kind, of which Dr. Pise must be considered the founder."

In spite of his critics, Dr. Pise went on and gave his public a

constant stream of prose and verse. Besides the two books already mentioned the list of his publications included: "A History of the Church From Its Establishment to the Reformation" (five volumes, 1830); "Pleasures of Religion and Other Poems" (1883); "Aletheia, or Letters on the Truths of Catholic Doctrine" (1843); "Letters to Ada," and "Zenosius, or the Puritan Convert" (1845). This was described as a "beautiful and attractive volume, the first of a series" for instruction in religious truths. "St. Ignatius and His First Companions" (1845); "Acts of the Apostles in Blank Verse" (1845); "The Catholic Bride" (from the Italian, 1845), and "Horae Vagabundae" letters descriptive of a tour of Ireland.

Dr. Pise came to New York from Baltimore in 1833 and joined the Rev. Dr. Felix Varela and Father Joseph Schneller in the editorial management (1833-1836) of the *Weekly Register*, a paper that was published to counteract the influence of New York's first Catholic paper, the *Truth Teller,* which had become tainted with "trusteeism." They also began a monthly magazine of general literature, the *Catholic Expositor* (1842-1844), the numbers of which are filled with an amazing variety of contributions in prose and verse from Dr. Pise. He was specially facile in Latin verse, of which the *Expositor* preserves many examples. The late Mgr. Brann, in a memoir for RECORDS AND STUDIES, says of this talent:

"No secular priest in this country since Dr. Pise has equaled him as a writer of smooth Latin verse or correct Latin prose, or as a writer of polished English prose and poetry. The blood and the spirit of the race of Dante told in his style: he must have studied 'Vita Nuova,' and imitated the beautiful simplicity of its diction."

Charles Constantine Pise was born on November 22, 1801, at Annapolis, Md. His father was an Italian and his mother, Margaret Gamble, a Philadelphian. They sent him to Georgetown College for his education and the chapter of the college history for 1815, the year Congress gave the college its charter, says:

"The Commencement was held on the 28th of July, before a large audience. It comprised the usual exercises, but no degrees were conferred. . . . After the distribution of premiums, most

of the students returned to their homes. Several, including Aloysius Young, Joseph Schneller, James Ryder, Charles Pise and George Fenwick, proceeded the next day to enter the Novitiate of the Society."

Young Pise was a Jesuit scholastic in Rome when the death of his father obliged him to return to the United States and withdraw from the Society. He later went to continue his theological studies at Mount St. Mary's Seminary, Emmitsburg, where he became one of the teaching staff and had as a pupil the future Cardinal McCluskey. He was ordained priest March 19, 1825. One of his former students contributed to "The Story of the Mountain" (1911), this description of him:

"The Rev. Father Pise, professor of rhetoric and poetry, was the handsomest man in the College, and was supposed to be the handsomest man in the United States. His hair was combed back in tresses, his countenance was delicately chiseled, his figure was perfect, and his step was elastic, every movement evinced grace. He had schooled himself to that degree that he did not appear to be conscious of it. He was too intelligent for that. His bearing was affable and cordial to everyone connected with the college, from the President down to the most humble individual that challenged the protection of the institution. He was learned and accomplished, and held the sincere affection of every person who met him even by occasional contact."

After his ordination he was attached to the Baltimore Cathedral for several years and was then transferred to St. Patrick's Church, Washington. Society at the capital lionized him and, on motion of Henry Clay, he was appointed chaplain of the United States Senate December 11, 1832—the only Catholic priest to attain that distinction—which office he held for two years. He then paid his second visit to Rome and appeared at the Sapienza for public examination for the degree of Doctor of Divinity. Pope Gregory XVI personally bestowed on him the doctor's cap and ring and in addition made him a Knight of the Holy Roman Empire. On his return to the United States in 1834 he accepted the invitation of his former Emmitsburg associate, Bishop Dubois, and was affiliated to the diocese of New York, where in addition to the great amount of controversial and literary activities under-

taken with his college classmate, Father Joseph Schneller, above referred to, he did parish work at St. Joseph's and St. Peter's churches until 1849. In that year Bishop Hughes sent him to Brooklyn to found the new parish of St. Charles Borromeo. This was in the fashionable "Heights section," not far from Beecher's famous Plymouth Church, and Dr. Pise's brilliant sermons and the imposing manner in which all his services were conducted soon made St. Charles' a very popular local institution. Its music, under the direction of a noted operatic artiste, Madame De Lussan, whose daughter, Zelie, was the Metropolitan favorite of the last generation, was always notable. Here he labored indefatigably until his death, March 26, 1866. Although his early associations were with the South, during the trying Civil War period his influence was unceasingly loyal. He had a large cross made out of a piece of the oak timber of the old frigate Constitution which he set up inside the church. This was unfortunately destroyed by a fire that ruined the edifice in 1868. His apostrophe to the American flag which he wrote, in 1855, during a Know Nothing flurry is often quoted. At his funeral Archbishop McCluskey, his former pupil at Emmitsburg, preached and paid a loving tribute to his amiable character and many-sided abilities. If he were alive today he would no doubt be in the forefront of the advocates of every move to promote sound, popular literature, for it was the same incentive that they now have that prompted him to become our first American Catholic novelist.

Perhaps, as a contemporary of Dr. Pise, some special mark of consideration might also be given to our first American Catholic woman editor and journalist, Joanna Monica England, the youngest sister of the famous Bishop of Charleston. She was only twenty years of age when she came across the Atlantic in December, 1820, and set up for her illustrious brother, the little home in Haseel street, Charleston, that soon became a national shrine. He himself said of her in a letter to his friend, Bishop Bruté:

"She was a sensible companion, a great literary aid, a gentle monitor who pointed out my faults, who checked my vanity, who taught me that what was done was the work of God and not that of a miserable and frail instrument which He used. She did

more by the sacrifice of her money and of her comforts to establish the diocese than was done by an other means I know."

Bishop England was the founder of our first Catholic weekly paper, the Charleston *Miscellany,* which under his direction at once attained a national influence and prestige. Even today its pages are an arsenal of facts and arguments for those who have to wage the battle of Catholic apologetics. In the success of this journal Joanna England had no small part. Her personal contributions, owing to the obstacle of anonymity, cannot now be definitely traced, but there are many indications that they were not infrequent. In his history of the rise and progress of our Catholic press the Rev. Dr. Paul Foik says of Miss England:

"No greater loss befell Bishop England than that of his sister, the angel who had assisted him in his labors and cheered him when he was weighed down with trials and discouragements. She had a wonderful influence on his life. Nowhere was this sway more sublimely exercised than in the conduct of the *Miscellany.* The Bishop's earnest temper sometimes unconsciously infused a sternness into his logic. Her gentleness smoothed away the harshness of his chief controversial articles. Frequently he rebelled at her censorship, but she was never perturbed on such occasions. She would use a few words of persuasion and invariably he yielded to her gentle jurisdiction. Her presence always shed over him a magic charm which was fatal to all opposition on his part. Her elegant literary taste governed in a large measure the literary department of the *Miscellany.*"

When this brilliant and versatile first of our Catholic women journalists died at Charleston, a yellow fever victim, in her twenty-seventh year, on October 14, 1827, the whole community went into mourning for her. Dr. Guilday, in his life of Bishop England, comments that after her death the *Miscellany* lacked that gentler tone on American Church affairs which had, up to that date, prevailed in its pages.

Not many, it is sad to relate, of the present generation know anything about these two distinguished pioneers in our American Catholic literature. The centenary of American Catholic fiction, therefore, would be an appropriate time to correct this fault and exalt their well-deserved fame.

Early American Catholic Poetry

The earliest American Catholic poem in English seems to have come from the pen of the famous Jesuit Father John Lewis, who left among his sermons and other manuscripts at Georgetown College, a description of a journey he made, on April 4, 1750, from Patapsco to Annapolis. This relic when found by some one at the college was sent to the "Editor's Table" section of the old Baltimore *Metropolitan* magazine, for April, 1856. In this issue of the magazine the editor at his desk, reading and commenting on the poetry sent in for his consideration says:

"While on the subject of poetry," continued Father C., "permit me to offer the following poetical journey, which I think will prove of interest to our readers. It will certainly do for a reminiscence of the colonial days of our State, and tell how the laborious Fathers, to whose zeal we owe so much for the preservation of the light of Faith in Maryland, employed their leisure moments. Father Lewis, the author, came to this country in 1749, and was first stationed as a permanent missioner at Bohemia on the Eastern Shore. From several dates affixed to his sermons he seems not to have confined himself exclusively to that mission, but to have visited from time to time Annapolis, Elkridge, Christine, Whitemarsh, and even the lower missions of St. Inigoes, and Newtown. It was perhaps in consequence of one of these visits that his muse was inspired to sing the piece I hold in my hand, and for which I am indebted to the researches of a friend.

"He was Superior of all the missions at various times, and to him the venerated Bishop Challenor addressed the brief of Pope Clement XIV, announcing the suppression of the Jesuits. His character among his brother missionaries may be gathered from the fact that in two assemblies, one particular, of those attached to the southern district, and the other general, both held at Newtown, St. Mary's county, in 1783, he was elected Superior, a manifest proof of the esteem in which he was held and of the satisfaction he had given, when he was their Superior by appointment from Rome. A considerable number of his sermons are yet preserved in manuscript in Georgetown College, D. C., and by their mildness and unction are a further proof of the great spirit by which

he was governed. He died at Bohemia on the 24th of March, 1788, much regretted. Oliver in his 'Memoirs' says: 'Dr. John Carroll, in a letter dated 20th April of that year, movingly regrets the loss of this valuable Father.'

"This copy is taken from a manuscript of the Rev. Father himself, which in two places is so corroded by age as to be illegible. What remains, however, is enough to show that the good missionary would have figured no less conspicuously in the literary than he has in the religious world, had he chosen to devote himself to it."

Then follows Father Lewis' poem of 137 lines:

THE REV. FATHER LEWIS—HIS JOURNEY FROM PATAPSCO TO ANNAPOLIS, APRIL 4, 1750

At length the wintry horrors disappear,
And April views with smiles the infant year;
The grateful earth from frosty chains unbound
Pours out its vernal treasures all around,
Her face bedeck with grass, with buds the trees are crowned.
In this soft season, ere the dawn of day,
I mount my horse and lonely take my way,
From woody hills that shade Patapsco's head
(In whose deep vales he makes his stony bed,
From whence he rushes with resistless force
Though huge rough rocks retard his rapid course,)
Down to Annapolis on that smooth stream,
Which took from Anne-Arundel fair her name.
And now the star that ushers in the day
Begins to pale her ineffectual ray.
The Moon with blunted horns now shines less bright,
Her fading face eclips'd with growing light.
The fleecy clouds with streaky lustre glow,
And day quits Heav'n to view the earth below.
O'er yon tall pines the Sun shows half his face,
And fires their floating foliage with his rays;
Now sheds aslant on earth his lightsome beams,
That trembling shine in many-colour'd streams.
Slow rising from the marsh the mist recedes,
The trees emerging rear their dewy heads;
Their dewy heads the Sun with pleasure views,
And brightens into pearls the pendent dews.
The beasts uprising quit their leafy beds,
And to the cheerful Sun erect their heads.

In vain the day awakes, sleep seals their eyes,
Till hunger breaks the bond and bids them rise.
Meanwhile the Sun with more exalted ray
From cloudless skies distributes riper day;
Through sylvan scenes my journey I pursue,
Ten thousand, beauties rising to my view;
Which kindle my breast poetic flame,
And bid me my Creator's praise proclaim,
  Here various flowerers grace the teeming plains
Adorned by Nature's hand with beauteous stains.
First-born of Spring, the bloodroot there appears,
Whose golden root a silver blossom rears.
In spreading tufts see there the crow-foot blue,
On whose green leaves still shines a globous dew;
Behold the cinque-foil with its dazzling dye
Of flaming yellow, wounds the tender eye;
But there, inclosed the grassy wheat is seen
To heal the aching sight with cheerful green.
  Safe in yon cottage dwells the monarch-swain,
His subject flocks close-grazing hide the plain
For him they live;—and die t'uphold his reign.
Viands unbought his well-tilled lands afford,
And smiling plenty waits upon his board;
Health shines with sprightly beams around his head,
And sleep with downy wings o'ershades his bed:
His sons robust his daily labour share
Patient of toil, companions of his care:
And all their toils with sweet success are crown'd,
In graceful ranks their trees adorn the ground,
The peach, the plum, the apple tree here are found,
Delicious fruits!—Which from their kernels rise,
So fruitful is the soil, so mild the skies.
The lowly quince yon sloping hill o'ershades,
Here lofty cherry-trees erect their heads;
Low at whose sandybase the river glides,
Slow-rolling near their height his languid tides,
Shade above shade the trees in rising ranks
Clothe with eternal green his sleepy banks:
The flood, well-pleased, reflects their verdant gleam
From the smooth mirror of his limpid stream.
  But see the hawk, who with acute survey
Tow'ring in air predestinates his prey
Amid the floods!—Down dropping from on high,
He strikes the fish, and bears him thro' the sky.
The stream disturbed no longer shows the scene,
That lately stained its silver waves with green;

In spreading circles roll the troubled floods,
And to the shores bear off the pictured woods.
Now looking round I view the out-stretched land,
O'er which the sight exerts a wide command:
The fertile valleys, and the naked hills,
The cattle feeding near the crystal rills;
The lawn's wide opening to the sunny ray,
And mazy thickets that exclude the day,
Awhile the eye is pleased these scenes to trace,
Then hurrying o'er the intermediate space,
Far distant mountains dressed in blue appear,
And all their woods are lost in empty air.
The Sun near setting now arrays his head
In milder beams and lengthens ev'ry shade.
The rising clouds usurping on the day
A bright variety of dyes display;
About the wide horizon swift then fly
And chase a change of colours round the sky:
And now I view but half the flaming sphere,
Now one faint glimmer shoots along the air,
And all his golden glories disappear.
Onward the Evening moves in habit grey,
And for her sister Night prepares the way.
The plumy people seek their secret nests:
A rest repairs the ruminating beasts.
Now, deep'ning shades confess th' approaching night.
Imperfect images elude the sight:
From earthly objects I remove my eye,
And view with look erect the vaulted sky;
Where dimly-shining now the stars appear,
At first thin-scattering thro' the misty air;
Till Night conformed, her jetty throne ascends
On her the Moon in clouded state attends,
But soon unveiled her lovely face is seen,
And stars unnumbered wait around the Queen;
Rang'd by their Maker's hand in just array,
They march majestic thro' th' ethereal way.
Are these bright luminaries hung on high
Only to please with twinkling rays our eye?
Or may we rather count each star a sun
Round which full-people worlds their courses run?
Orb above orb harmoniously they steer
Their various voyages thro' seas of air.
Snatch me some Angel to some high abodes
The seat perhaps of Saints and demigods!
Where such as bravely scorned the galling yoke

Of Vulgar Error, and her fetters broke;
Where Patriots, who to fix the public good
In fields of battle sacrificed their blood;
Philosophers who strove to mend our hearts,
And such as polished life with useful arts
Obtain a place; when by the hand of death
Touched, they retire from this poor speck of earth,
Their spirits freed from bodily alloy
Perceive a foretaste of the endless joy,
Which from eternity has been prepared
To crown their labors with a vast reward.
While to these orbs our wandering thoughts aspire,
A falling meteor shoots his lambent fire.

* * * * * *

Another interesting example is to be found in the curious location of the appendix (pp. cxxi—cxxviii), of an old volume "The Catholic Question in America" by William Sampson (New York, 1813).

William Sampson was born in Londonderry in 1764, the son of a Protestant minister. He was a lawyer of repute in Belfast when his generous professional aid to the victims of the '98 rebellion, many of them Catholic, drew on him an accusation of treason and he was driven into exile. In New York his legal ability sent him to the front rank of the bar of the day, and as he also was a proficient stenographer he was the first practitioner to make formal court records. The case that brought him into our Catholic annals came up in March, 1813, when a merchant named James Keating charged one Phillips with receiving goods that had been stolen from him. Before the trial came on two other men were arrested as the thieves and Keating, a Catholic, having recovered his property asked to have the case against Phillips dismissed. This was refused.

When the case was brought to trial in the Court of General Sessions, De Witt Clinton, who was the Mayor of New York, presided. Keating was asked why he wanted the case dismissed and answered that his property had been restored to him as restitution through the confessional by the Jesuit Father Anthony Kohlmann, then pastor of St. Peter's church, Barclay Street, and Administrator of the diocese. Father Kohlmann immediately was cited to court as a witness and asked to disclose from whom he

had received the stolen property. He refused to answer, denying the right of the court to question a priest as to facts unknown to him except through the confessional. In his answer he availed himself of the occasion to set forth at length the doctrine of the Church on the Sacrament of Penance.

The main issue of the case was then halted for the argument of the contention that Father Kohlmann should be committed for contempt of court in refusing to disclose whence he had received the stolen goods. The proceedings over the many legal technicalities that came up prolonged the trial until June 14, 1813, when Clinton as presiding judge of the court gave its unanimous decision that the priest could not be called on to testify as to facts that came to his knowledge only by virtue of his ministry, thus concluding his very lucid decision:

"We speak of this question not in a theological sense but in its legal and Constitutional bearings. Although we differ from the witness and his brethren in our religious creed yet we have no reason to question the purity of his motives or to impeach their good conduct as citizens. They are protected by the laws and constitution of this country in the full and free exercise of their religion, and this court can never countenance or authorize the application of insult to their Faith or of torture to their consciences."

Fifteen years later, Clinton was Governor of New York and the legislature undertook to revise the statutes of the State. When the section treating of the immunity of witnesses came up his experiences in the Kohlmann case helped him to frame the enactment which is the law today:

"No minister of the Gospel or priest of any denomination whatsoever shall be allowed to disclose any confessions made to him in his professional character in the course of discipline enjoined by the rules or practices of the religious body to which he belongs."

New York thus led the way in enacting the law that has since found its way into the codes of the other States of the Union, and merits the honor of being the first of all English-speaking communities, since the Protestant Reformation, to protest by its courts and laws the inviolability and sanctity of auricular Confession. The Keating case provoked a long and acrimonious public controversy in which a number of clerical contenders, Catholic and non-Catholic, contributed sermons and pamphlets. Nota-

ble among these in adverse terms was the apostate Jesuit Charles H. Wharton, the rector of the Protestant Episcopal St. Mary's Church, Burlington, New Jersey, and sometime President of Columbia College, New York. Although he thus inveighed against the Confessional in a 130-page pamphlet published at Philadelphia, in 1814, it is of record that he remembered the prerogative of the sacerdotal office he abandoned, and gave absolution to a dying Irish servant of his own household when no other priest was available.

During all Father Kohlmann's court experience William Sampson was his faithful counsel and ever reliable aid. When the trial ended he compiled the record and published it with the title: "The Catholic Question in America. 'Whether a Roman Catholic Clergyman be in any case compellable to disclose the Secrets of Auricular Confession.'" To this record, as an appendix, Father Kohlmann added: "A True Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church touching the Sacrament of Penance with the Ground on which this Doctrine is Founded." Another most interesting addition to the appendix was "A Canto on the Jesuits, taken from the Latin of J. Vanière, rendered into English by Arthur Murphy, Esq." This translation of the canto from the Georgic "Praedium Rusticum" in sixteen cantos of Father James Vanière (1664-1739) is perhaps the earliest American printed Catholic poem in English. The whole book is one of our oldest and most valued Catholic publications. Very few copies are now available and these only in scattered libraries. The quotations used in the appendix follow:

The following is a description of Paraguay and the work of the "Bees" there:

Paraguay is a Province of South America, bounded by Brazil on the east and by Peru and Chili on the west. It is sometimes called La Plata, from the river of that name, which rises in Peru, and running a long course, falls into the Paraguay near Buenos Ayres, where their united stream discharges itself into the Atlantic Ocean. The author of the European Settlements in America (who, Dr. Robertson says, ought not to remain unknown, as his work would do honor to any man in England) informs us, that early in the last century, the Jesuits represented to the Court of Spain, that the Empire of the Gospel might be extended into the most unknown parts of America, and that all those countries might be reduced

to his Catholic Majesty's obedience, without expense, and without force. The remonstrance was listened to with attention; the sphere of the Jesuits was marked out; an uncontrollable liberty was given to them within those limits; and the governors of the adjacent provinces had orders not to interfere. The Jesuits entered upon the scene of action, and opened their spiritual campaign. They began by gathering together about fifty wandering families whom they persuaded to settle and they united them into a little township. Upon this slight foundation they built a superstructure, which has amazed the world, and added so much power, that it has brought great envy and jealousy on their society.

When they had made a beginning, they laboured with such indefatigable pains, and with such masterly policy, that, by degrees, they mollified the minds of the most savage nations; fixed the most rambling, and attracted the most averse to government. They prevailed upon thousands of various dispersed tribes of people to embrace their religion, and submit to their government. When they had submitted, the Jesuits left nothing undone, that could induce them to remain in subjection, or that could tend to increase their number. It is said, that from such inconsiderable beginnings, their subjects, several years ago amounted to three hundred thousand families. They accomplished a most extraordinary conquest over the bodies and minds of so many people, without arms or violence, and differently from the methods of all other conquests; not by cutting off a large number of the inhabitants to secure the rest, but by multiplying the people, whilst they extended their territory.

The Indians, under the Jesuits, lived in towns; they were regularly clad; they laboured in agriculture; they exercised manufactures.

The country of Paraguay is divided into forty-seven districts: in each mission a Jesuit presides in chief: the magistrates are always Indians, elected by the people, and approved by the presiding Jesuit. Nothing can equal the obedience of the people of the several missions, except their contentment under them.

The Indians are instructed in the military line with the most exact discipline, and can raise sixty thousand men well armed.

Their churches are particularly grand, and richly adorned; and service in them is performed with all the solemnity and magnificence of a cathedral.

Each man's labour is allotted to him in proportion to his strength and skill in the profession which he exercises. The product is brought faithfully into the public magazines, from which he is again supplied with all things that the managers judge to be expedient for the sustenance of himself and family. All necessaries are distributed regularly twice a week, and the magazines

always contain such a stock of provisions and goods of every kind, as to answer not only the ordinary exigencies, but to provide against a time of scarcity, or for those whom accidents, age or infirmities have disqualified for labour.

The Jesuits are said to be extremely strict in preserving the privilege of keeping all strangers from amongst them. If any such should by accident, or in his journey arrive in the country of the missions, he is immediately carried to the Presbytery, where he is treated, for a day or two at most, with great hospitality, but regarded with no less circumspection. The curiosities of the place are showed him in company with the Jesuit, and he can have no private conversation with the natives. In a reasonable time, he is civilly dismissed with a guard to conduct him to the next district, without expense, where he is treated in the same manner, until he is out of the country of the missions.

Many have represented the conduct of the Jesuits in this mission in a very bad light; but their reflections are not at all supported by the facts, upon which they build them. To judge properly of the service they have done their people, we must not consider them on a parallel with the flourishing nations of Europe, but as compared with their neighbors, the savages of South America, or with the state of those Indians who groan under the Spanish yoke. Considering the matter in this, which is the true light, it will appear, that human society is infinitely obliged to the Jesuits, for adding three hundred thousand families in a well regulated community, in the room of a few untaught savages, whom they found in the beginning of their mission. And indeed it can scarce be conceived that the government had not some very extraordinary perfection, which had a principle of increase within itself; which drew others to unite themselves to the old stock, and which continued, for so many years, to shoot out in a luxuriance of new branches. Nor can we, by any means, blame a system, which produced such salutary effects, and which has found that difficult, but happy way, that grand desideratum in politics, of uniting a perfect subjection to an entire content and satisfaction of the people. This great and generous principle it is to be wished were studied with more attention by us, who content ourselves with railing at the diligence of an adversary, which, when founded on moral rectitude, we should rather praise and imitate; and who, in our own affairs, seldom think of using other instruments than force and money.

Vanière, it maybe said gives in this place, with partiality to his own order, a high-flown panegyric on the missionaries of Paraguay. But when we have seen him, in the whole tenor of the foregoing notes, supported by the able and well-informed author of the Settlements of America, it must be allowed that our poet does

not exceed the bounds of truth, and pays a tribute of applause where it was justly due.

The extraordinary commonwealth established by the Jesuits must have been conducted with wisdom, virtue and benevolence since it continued flourishing and increasing more than a century and a half, up to the time of its dissolution in the year 1767, when that glorious fabric vanished in a day. It appears that in the year 1757, by a convention between Spain and Portugal, part of the territory of Paraguay was assigned to the latter; but the Indians, who occupied the ceded country refused to be transferred from one hand to another, like a herd of cattle without their own consent. A fierce battle ensued, and the natives were defeated by well disciplined European troops. From that time, the Jesuits were beheld with a jealous eye by the Spanish Court, and at length in 1767, they were seized by order of the King of Spain, and sent out of America, leaving the Indians to experience for the future the rigours of Spanish tyranny, instead of that mild and equitable government, which had for a length of time, preserved peace and virtue, and, by consequence, public happiness.

The present writer has been assiduous in collecting the notes, because Vanière, who has proved himself the Historian of the Bees, will also appear to be the faithful Historian of Paraguay, a subject more connected with the Bees than Virgil's Story of Orpheus and Euridice.

(Thus far the translator and author of the notes on Vanière. If the author had carried his researches a little further, he would have discovered the true cause of the suppression of the Jesuits, to spring not so much from jealousy of the Spanish court, as from the intrigues of the adepts of Antichristian Philosophy, who saw in this society, from their assiduity in training up youth, etc., to virtue and science, the greatest obstacle to their impious systems, and views).

The following Canto, taken from the Latin of J. Vanière, and beautifully rendered into English by Arthur Murphy, esq. (latest edition printed at Middletown, Connecticut, for I. Riley, New York) will present a just and faithful portrait of the Religious Order of the Jesuits and will enable the public to form a very different opinion of this learned and ill-requited Society from that derived from prejudiced and ill informed writers.

The Bees

Torn by convulsions while nations groan,
Astraea has not yet resign'd her throne.
A moral race on earth she still maintains,
Where with sound policy fair virtue reigns.
Wish you that happy region to survey?

Cross the Atlantic; sail to Paraguay.
Mark how the people and their manners please;
He paints them best who paints the tribe of Bees.
See from the hive how they transplant their laws,
Like Bees, industrious in their country's cause.
Their fields and pastures know no separate bounds,
And no litigious fences mark the grounds.
For tracts of land no title deeds are shown
And vile ejectments, there are things unknown.
No bonds, no mortgages for money lent,
And no proud landlord can distrain for rent.
All lies in common; what their crops produce.
Is stor'd in magazines for public use.
All have their province in the general toil;
These guide the state and those manure the soil.
Some tend the fold their milk-white flocks to sheer;
Along the vale the lowing herds to hear.
The shepherd plods with joy; th' industrious hind
Works at the mill, the ripen'd corn to grind.
With Vulcan's skill some at the forge attend,
To shape the sickle or the plough-share bend.
True social concord all their actions show,
And with warm sympathy their bosoms glow,
To every rank affection they extend,
Their neighbor's interest with their own they blend.
While the swain toils abroad, with anxious care
They view his cottage, and the works repair.
The swain at night finds all defects redress'd,
And with his door unlock'd sinks careless down to rest.
Of sovereign sway the laws no system know;
The chiefs to wisdom all their influence owe.
To their sage counsels men obedience pay,
And walk secure where virtue leads the way.
No code of laws they want, no statesman's art;
Their law is grav'd by nature on the heart.
While private wealth no individuals hold,
They feel no love of ill-persuading gold.
The generous mind pale envy never stings;
Their only strife from emulation springs.
Though here the young may bridle their desires
By that best rule, th' example of their sires;
Yet still their minds to polish and refine,
And give the grace that bids each action shine,
They call the masters of each liberal art,
Men who can truly philosophy impart;

Who teach the rules which long the test have stood,
Of that best science to be wise and good.
The chiefs elected by the public voice
By wisdom strive to justify the choice;
While the inhabitants for work design'd,
Practice the arts that form the laboring hind.
No vain pre-eminence of rank they know,
No Lords, no commoners, nor high, nor low.
The ploughman's industry, the soldier's fame
To praise and honor give an equal claim.
Though Ceres spreads her gifts with lavish hand,
And peace her olive branch waves o'er the land:
Though grim-eyed war sleeps in his iron cave,
And their foes dread them, for they know them brave—
Yet this wise people watchful of alarms
Are vigilant and prompt to rise in arms.
But still they joy in bidding discord cease,
Ready for war, yet readier far for peace;
In that firm attitude their state protect,
From insult safe, while valour gains respect.
To train their troops when leisure can afford,
The farmers quit the plough-share for the sword.
On sacred days when wafted from the skies
Their hymns and pealing organs cease to rise;
When their devotion ends its pious strain,
The volunteers embodied seek the plain.
In martial order as they move along,
To view their discipline the people throng,
Admiring gaze, with military pride
As now their ranks they close, and now divide;
Now point their javelins, and now aim the lance,
And with dissembled rage retreat, advance;
In various evolutions skill display,
And give a battle in their mimic fray.
The Spaniard, o'er that clime who holds his reign,
Well knows their valour in th' embattled plain:
And lately saw, when he their aid requir'd,
The bands with warlike emulation fir'd;
Saw them spring up, like Cadmus' earth-born crew,
When from the sod an iron harvest grew;
Saw them performing wonders in the field,
Mow down the ranks and force the foe to yield.
For feats like these no honours they demand,
But home return and take the spade in hand.
Her heroes Rome to demi-gods may raise,
And tuneful poets celebrate their praise,

Sing their dictators chosen from the plough
And weave immortal chaplets for their brow;
Tell, while their battles Cincinnatus fought,
How the wise senate in his absence thought.
His house and farm requir'd the ablest hands,
To give the victor his well cultur'd lands.
They were his farmers; for his private gain
Tended his flock, his plants, his household train.
At Paraguay no separate lands we see,
But for the public all is held in fee.
They love the warrior, in his country's cause
Who draws his sword for freedom and the laws.

The warriors there the scythe or javelin wield,
Soldiers in field and laborours in the field.
Yet the've no property, no private claim
No Sabine farm, where they enjoy their fame.
Hear this, Old Rome, and blush, however late,
For your Patrician and Equestrian state.
Whene'er the seasons rough with storm appears,
His private loss no individual fears.
When torrents from the hills rush down amain,
And meditate destruction to the grain,
Alarm'd for all, he hears the deluge roar,
Feels for the state, and thinks of self no more.
Not rich, when round him ripen'd crops appear;
Not poor, when lost the promise of the year;
But still, let fortune smile or prove unkind,
He holds the even balance of his mind.
Of Europe, and her state, and various ways,
In happy ignorance they pass their days;
Content against their foes to make a stand,
And chase all sects, all atheists from the land.
Around their harbours cottages they keep,
Built on the margin of the brawling deep;
There with kind aid the mariners supply,
But further hospitality deny.
His road no traveller must there pursue,
Their laws, their manners, and their towns to view.
While thus they live, unknowing, and unknown,
Free from the ills that make poor mortals groan;
Fame, with whom fictions more than truth prevail,
To Europe flies, and spreads her wonderous tail;
Tells how Ignatius' sons, in every crime
Grown bold, are tyrants in the western clime;
Usurpers, and apostates from their God,

Who rule the Indians with an iron rod.
Europe believes what lying rumours say,
Though suffering hence herself beneath the rising day;
Driven from Japan her sons, how great her loss,
While the Batavians trample on the cross,
Through base apostacy their station hold
In every port, and truck their God for gold.
At Paraguay no colonies you'll find
Combin'd to plunder, and oppress mankind;
Nor laws, nor men allow despotic sway,
But thee, FAIR VIRTUE! thee all ranks obey.

Benighted long, all sacred truth unknown,
With savage herds, themselves as savages grown,
The natives roam'd no duty understood,
Fierce, naked, wild, mere tenants of the wood,
Till late instructed in the Christian lore
They hail their God, fall prostrate and adore.
Fair peace and moral laws they now maintain,
And harmony and virtue round them reign.
These arts Ignatius' sons, these pious deeds
Spring from your zeal—your mission thus succeeds.
You draw th' untutor'd Indians from their den,
The truth impart and mold them into men.
To God you give, what his OWN SON design'd,
When on the cross to bitter pangs resign'd,
He died in agony for all mankind.
Your duty done, you seek no worldly store;
Your conscience pays you and you ask no more.
Thrice happy they o'er whom you thus preside,
Reclaim from error, and to virtue guide;
Who taught by you, their industry employ,
And in the public good their own enjoy:
Who to their neighbors sacrifice their ease,
And take their model from the REALM OF BEES.

Arthur Murphy (1727-1805), who made this translation of Father Vanière's "Bees," was an author, actor and literateur prominent in London during the last half of the Eighteenth Century. He was the son of Richard Murphy, an Irish merchant, and born in the County Roscommon, December 27, 1727. His father died and a maternal aunt took the boy to France, and sent him to the Jesuit college at St. Omer, where he remained six years. Returning to London in 1744 he tried a business career for a short time but abandoned it to frequent the theatres and coffee houses

and tried the study of law also. In 1754 he went on the stage and was received with some favor. He then took to writing farces, comedies, and tragedies. Some of them attained success. The "Dictionary of National Biography" says he was "a favorite in society, a guest at noble houses and much respected and courted." He died in London, June 18, 1805. He published a number of translations from the classics. Father James Vanière, S.J. (1664-1739) was a Frenchman and very elegant Latin poet. His poem "Praedium Rusticum" in sixteen cantos, from which Mr. Murphy made the foregoing translation was much admired in the literary world.

Pioneer Women Writers

Mention having been made of Joanna England as our first Catholic women writer, it might be noted that the first place among notable women writers in the field of Catholic American literature should be given to Mother Elizabeth Seton, founder of the Sisters of Charity in the United States. Her journal and charming letters, collected and published in 1869, by her grandson, the late Archbishop Robert Seton, entitle her to this honor. In them, as he says, in his introduction, she speaks her own mind and reveals her heart. A devoted wife, a tender mother, and a sincere Religious, she was a typical American woman of her day, energetic, gentle, resourceful and destined to found the Catholic education system in the United States. To her the credit must be given for organizing, through the five great branches of her Sisters of Charity, the parish school training of the present day.

Her letters and journal give entertaining details and attractive pictures of social conditions in New York following the establishment of the Republic. They record the kindness and sympathy she found among cultured Catholics in Italy when the tragic death of her husband left her and her little daughter penniless and forlorn in that foreign land. It was the preliminary step to her conversion. The trials of her troubled soul and the means and eminent counsellors contributing to her acceptance of the true Faith are depicted with graphic and certain touch. There is even a bit of winsome romance told in the story of the courtship of her youngest daughter, who was jilted by a suitor.

Letitia Cunningham was the author of a 51-page, 12 mo. pamphlet: "The Case of the Whigs Who Loaned their Money on the Public Faith Fairly Stated, Including a memento for Congress to renew their engagements and to establish the Honour and Honesty of the U. S. A." It was published at Philadelphia by Francis Bailey in 1783 and Finotti, in his "Bibliographia Catholica Americana," says of the author: "Some not only suggest but maintain that Letitia Cunningham was a Catholic, but I can find no records. A well-instructed non-Catholic bookseller in New York informs me that for a time she entered a convent in Europe."

BEGINNINGS OF GOVERNMENT IN MARYLAND

Grace H. Sherwood

Now that the tercentenary of the settlement of Maryland is approaching the beginnings of government in Maryland are extremely interesting to the student of history. For nearly five years after the Province was planted all the Free Men had the right to sit in the General Assembly, the Governor and his Council forming part of the Assembly and sitting with the Free Men in one House. In this, as in religious toleration, Maryland was unique among the colonies.

In Virginia this was not so. There, Burgesses were chosen always, even for Virginia's first Assembly which met in July, 1619 and marked the beginning of legislative government in America. And in the Massachusetts Bay Colony there were Selected Burgesses, also; their number being quite small in proportion to the total number of Free Men residing in the colony and who were further limited by religious test, Puritans only being eligible (1).

In Maryland, on the contrary, there were no restrictions. Every Free Man, whether Protestant or Catholic, was entitled to sit in the Assembly merely because he was a Free Man. And he represented in the Assembly at first neither hundred nor county, but himself, giving "voyce" for himself alone unless, indeed, he held proxies for other Free Men in which case he gave "voyce" for them also. These proxies, however, did not, in any sense, turn him into a burgess. A proxy merely made the one holding it the personal representative of another freeman who could not attend. The giver's right to revoke the proxy and appear in person, if he so desired, still held and was availed of more than once.

Writers on constitutional government have pointed out these distinctions in Maryland's first assemblies. Hannis Taylor, in his "Origin and Growth of the English Constitution" (2) remarks that the first assemblies of Maryland resembled more nearly than did the other Colonial assemblies the old English *gemot* — the

seed of all legislative government among the English. The *gemot* or moot which was both assembly and court was introduced into England by the German tribes who conquered the native Britons. From the *gemot* sprang the *tun moot,* or meeting of the town, preserved in America in the northern colonies by the "township."

But as, centuries before, in Saxon England, the *gemot* had been a general meeting together of the King and his councillors and his Free Men, each having a voice for himself, so at first, in Maryland the General Assembly was, actually, a *gemot,* also, the Governor and his council representing what had been the royal element in the old English meeting.

Later on these distinctive features of the Maryland Assemblies were lost, as we shall see. The Free Men, sitting for themselves, were supplanted by burgesses who sat for them. The assembly was still further modified, in a few years, by division into an upper and a lower house. And later still, when the Puritan faction, invited in from Virginia where they were not welcome, had obtained the upper hand in Maryland affairs, the friendly toleration of differing Christian beliefs which had prevailed in Maryland until then was abolished and an act passed depriving Catholics of their liberties and making them ineligible to office. But for the first few years of the colony none of these things had come to pass. All Free Men had the right to sit in the Assembly. It was guaranteed them by the charter itself.

The Charter of Maryland, among other provisions for the Province, directed that Lord Baltimore should call an assembly of his Free Men "for the framing of laws when and as often as need shall require." "Or of their delegates" the charter added, thus making the later form legal also. (3) The Charter of Maryland was actually granted to Cecil Calvert, the second Lord Baltimore. But for it and the whole scheme for the colonization of Maryland, credit is due his father, George Calvert, the first Lord Baltimore. He had obtained from the King the grant of land for Maryland, but died before the charter could pass under the great seal, which it did in June, 1632. Maryland was made a Proprietary Province, the first of a number to be so made. Being the first it was probably the model for the others. The Proprietary

of such a Province had unusual privileges, was, in reality, a feudal prince.

In the Charter the king expressly declared that the Baron of Baltimore and his heirs were to have, in the Province, "as ample rights, jurisdictions, privileges, prerogatives, royalties, liberties, immunities and royal rights as any Bishop of Durham within the County Palatine of Durham within Our Kingdom of England."

These words, so often quoted, can be the more readily understood if, first, we understand clearly just what was a county Palatine and what were the rights of the bishop of such a county, particularly of the Bishop of Durham.

At that time, 1632, there were three such counties palatine in England, Durham being the chief. (4) The other two were Chester and Lancashire, the latter holding its privileges only since the year 1351. Durham and Chester had held their rights since the days of William the Conqueror. Among other rights which a county palatine had were these: in such a county the king's writs did not run, to use the expression current then. All authority to hold court, convene councils or assemblies, nominate sheriffs and other officers, receive profits from the courts, alienate land and in general exercise royal rights was derived from writs sent out, not by the king, but by the one ruling the county, earl or bishop, as the case might be, bishop in the case of Durham. In return the earl or bishop of such county palatine owed the king fealty.

So that when Charles the First gave the Baron of Baltimore by the charter of Maryland, all the rights belonging to the Bishop of Durham he created him, in reality, a prince with authority to make laws for the Province (with the consent of his Free Men) confer titles, if he wished, establish manors, parcel out land, collect quit rents, etc., he in return, by way of acknowledging his fealty to the king to return him at Windsor Castle each year on the Tuesday after Easter, two Indian arrows.

The charter having been granted Cecil Calvert brought to a conclusion the plans begun by his father for colonizing Maryland. He could not go out in person with the colonists as the attacks being made in England upon his plans necessitated his staying there to protect his interests. He therefore appointed his brother, Leonard Calvert, Governor and gave him two commissioners,

Jerome Hawley and Captain Thomas Cornwalleys. These three would constitute the Council, later on. The expedition, consisting of about three hundred souls, more or less, set sail from Cowes in the Isle of Wight, November 22, 1633, in two vessels, the Ark of Avalon and the Dove. Avalon was the name of the spot in England to which it is supposed Christianity was first brought. (5)

Having arrived at an island which they called St. Clement's, after the Saint on whose feast day they had left England, they landed. The island is now called Blackistone Island. On March 25, 1634, Lady Day and the first day of the year according to the calendar then in force, they came ashore, planted the cross and took possession of the land in the name of Our Saviour and the king. The Jesuit priests who had accompanied the colonists on their four months' journey then offered Mass.

The first Lord Baltimore, George Calvert, had had more in mind then merely founding a colony when he applied for a grant for Maryland. He had become a Catholic and had raised his children Catholics. He had long held public office in England but when he professed the Catholic Faith this became no longer possible and he resigned. By becoming a Catholic Lord Baltimore had entered a circumscribed class. The penal laws then in force in England forbade a Catholic to hear Mass or to say it. He had to pay a certain tax to the crown and could not leave the kingdom or even move about it freely without permission, was a recusant, one who did not attend Church of England services.

Lord Baltimore, having come into these disabilities himself and acquired them for his children was desirous, naturally, of finding or rather, founding a place to live where they would not hold. After his plan to colonize New Foundland turned out a failure because of the cold climate he went to Virginia but, as might be supposed, his religion made him unwelcome there, Virginia being a royal Province with the Church of England as the established Church and England's disabilities in the matter of religion holding there.

Neither George nor Cecil Calvert, who was the one to colonize Maryland, had any intention of making it a strictly Catholic Province nor had it in mind to circumscribe any Protestant colonist in any way because of the difference in faith between him and

the Proprietary and the Governor and his council, who were all Catholics. We know that this is so by certain fragments of early Maryland law (though law is hardly the word) which survive and indicate clearly the tenor of thought and custom in the Province from the very first.

One of these things, not fragmentary but entire, is the set of instructions given by Lord Baltimore to his brother and commissioners as the council were called, when they set out for Maryland. (8) It is in the Calvert Papers in the Maryland Historical Society's vaults and may be said to be the very beginnings of government in Maryland. According to these instructions religious toleration among the Maryland colonists was to prevail from the moment the two ships left English waters. The words of the instructions speak for themselves. They are in Cecil Calvert's own handwriting:

"His Lordship requires his governor and His Commissioners that in their voyage to Maryland they be very careful to preserve unity and peace among all the passengers and that they suffer no scandal nor offence to be given to any of the Protestants and that all Roman Catholics are to be silent upon all occasions of discourse concerning matters of religion. And that the said governor treat the Protestants with as much mildness and favor as justice will permit. This to be observed on land as well as on sea."

As Maryland was a Proprietary Province his Lordship's orders were law and government until such time as an assembly could be called and government established. That the Marylanders were influenced by Lord Baltimore's instructions to his governor becomes plain when one studies the actions of the early colonists. In an emergency, or when there was no law to go by, the Governor's commission was consulted and his proclamations became the law by which they abided and rendered judgment against their fellow men.

This latter statement is proved by the record of a trial held in the Spring of 1638, before there was a code of laws. William Lewis, a Catholic, was brought before the court charged with having interfered when his "servants" were reading aloud out of a Protestant book which abused Catholic priests and the Pope. (9) He was convicted of the offense, after trial, and fined, it being held

by the court, all the members of which were Catholics, that he had offended against a "publick proclamation which forbade all disputatious speech about religion as tending to disturb the publick peace of the colony."

No record of this proclamation remains. It seems to have been "This to be observed on land as well as at sea" put into practice, an extension of the "Instructions." That it had all the force of law is proved by the verdict and the fine when it was transgressed against by Lewis. Incidentally, the man who brought the charge, one Robert Sedgrave, called the attention of a Catholic priest to Lewis's behavior first, although he, himself was a Protestant and was by him, Thomas Copley, informed that Lewis had broken the law.

The men who settled Maryland were of two kinds, as far as circumstances went, but of one kind where character and ability were concerned. (10) The "Gentlemen Adventurers" were those who paid for themselves and the men they brought with them. These were, for the most part, it is computed, Catholics, a thing easy to understand since in those days, in England, Catholics were far from comfortable. Even those who were members of England's oldest families, who bore titles, were harassed by the Penal laws and found emigration to the New World expedient. Among the first adventurers are the names of several titled families. And Thomas Cornwalleys himself says, in a letter, that he came to Maryland to find security for his conscience. (11) In proportion to the number of men brought in and the year of arrival, early comers obtaining the most, adventurers were granted land, some in sufficient number of acres to create manors. (12)

The other class of colonists were those who had had their passage paid for them and in return, bound themselves to serve the men who "transported" them, whether as farm hand, mason, carpenter or clerk. Sometimes their services were sold by the one who was entitled to them for all or a portion of the time. But in no case did the one who was transported incur any stigma by coming in in this way. He might be spoken of as a "servant" but his servitude was a temporary condition only. It did not affect his standing in the community once it was over with.

When a "servant" had finished his indentured time he received

fifty acres of land, seed for planting, tools, etc. As fifty acres of land or forty pounds sterling constituted one a Free Man in the Province once his passage money was worked out the erstwhile "servant" became a Free Man and took his place in the assembly. The only difference between his status before his time of service was up and afterwards was that while he was not "free" he had no voice in affairs. Some indentured servants seemed to take their place in the assembly in a remarkably short time and more than one honorable Maryland family is descended from one so brought in.

It has been charged by those unfamiliar with Maryland history that some of these were convicts and prisoners for debt. This is not true of those transported to Maryland by the early colonists however true of other colonies. That there was neither prison nor jail in Maryland for twenty-eight years after it was founded is the best proof of the character of the men who settled the Province.

The foundations for the future of the Province were securely laid in the first six months of its existence. After St. Clement's Island had been found too small, thirty miles of territory on the mainland were purchased from the Indians. This was named Augusta Carolina, at first. It contained an Indian village out of which the Indians intended to move, anyhow, to escape the Susquehannocks. They stayed on for a while, showing the colonists how to plant and mill and cook corn. The Indian huts served for homes until houses could be built, one of them becoming a chapel, the first chapel in Maryland.

The first summer was devoted to raising plenty of food. So successful were the colonists in this that there was corn to spare and some was taken to New England in the Dove to exchange for salt. The Summer passed, Autumn and the storing of food came and then Winter set in. In the leisure that this, their first Winter in Maryland brought to them, the Free Men set about the task dearest of all to Englishmen, the making of laws. Virginia's first Assembly had met in the busiest of times for planters, the end of July. No wonder they sat only a few days, giving their attention merely to things that concerned Virginia only and letting the law of England stand for the Province. The Marylanders

chose a more leisurely time for their first Assembly. It was "holden" at St. Mary's in February, 1634, O. S., (that is, reckoning March 25 as the beginning of a new year).

All record of this, our first Assembly, has disappeared. That it met, we know, that it drew up a body of laws, we know and that these laws were sent to Lord Baltimore for his assent, a putting of the cart before the house. But who attended the Assembly and how it was convened, what the laws were that it passed (except one) and how many of them there were we shall probably never know. It met at St. Mary's, of course, probably, in the newly begun fort and was composed, most likely, of all the Free Men in the Province. And that is all we know of it except the one law passed by it, of which we shall speak later.

One historian has suggested that as the whole assembly became illegal when the Free Men took upon themselves the making of laws instead of waiting for Lord Baltimore to make them, these same Free Men may not have been one bit desirous of putting on record such high-handed proceedings and, purposely, kept no records of them. So much for one point of view, a bit far-fetched to the average reader.

Another and more likely view point is that the records were kept and were subsequently lost in the various upheavals of government which beset Maryland's first sixty years of existence. There was more than one occasion, during this period, when records were fought over, as it were, carted from State House to private house and back again; when State House and papers both became the subject of controversy and the seat of government was, finally removed from St. Mary's to Annapolis. Even here disaster followed, for a fire broke out in the State House there and destroyed many valuable papers. Any one of these occurences could have been responsible for the loss of all record of Maryland's first Assembly.

Be that as it may, the first Assembly of which we have record is the second Assembly, held in 1637, O. S. All written history of the government of Maryland begins with this year, except for that contained in the Calvert papers, letters, instructions, conditions of plantations, etc. There is written history of an earlier date, that contained in "A Relation of Maryland" written by

Father Andrew White, one of the Jesuits who accompanied the first colonists. This has to do, however, more with the settlement of Maryland. The beginnings of government, the settling into shape of the means by which it was to be carried on, the holding of the first courts, the sending out of the first warrants, the first trials, the changes in the assembly itself, how the Free Men came to wrest the power of making their own laws from the Proprietor — the history of all this began to be written in the year 1637, (O. S.) no sooner.

By that time the Province was nearly four years old. There was a mill where meal could be ground, a fort had been built, bricks had been made out of Maryland's very excellent soil for brick making and had been brought in, also, from Virginia. The huts in the village which had been bought from the Indians and the first hastily constructed "cottages" of the colonists had now given place to "houses." It is difficult to tell, three hundred years afterwards, just what was meant by a "cottage" then. (15) The distinction is too fine for us to make. Probably, log houses were called "cottages." At any rate, moderate prosperity seemed to obtain for all, by this time.

But the Province was without laws. The laws passed by the first Assembly had been sent to England for the Proprietor's assent. (16) But on April 15, 1637, nearly two years later, he formally dissented from them, composed a second body of laws himself and, that there might be ratification for them in Maryland, made out writs for an Assembly to be held the following January. The commission to his brother, Leonard Calvert, containing these writs, and the body of laws, his own, which would be binding when the Free Men assented to them, Lord Baltimore intrusted to the care of Mr. John Lewger, whom he had lately created Secretary of the Province, "Conservator of the Peace" for St. Mary's County, Register of wills and Surveyor of land, commissioner also and member of the Council of Maryland. Lewger, a clergyman, had become a Catholic and thereby lost his livelihood. He and Cecil Calvert had been friends from their Oxford days and as the latter was badly in need of a secretary for his Maryland Province he appointed his friend to the position. (17) Armed with his various documents Mr. Lewger, on November 26, 1637,

disembarked at St. Mary's from the good ship Unity with wife and son, maid servants and men and a capacity for setting down details.

Thanks to this latter gift we possess our first records of government in Maryland. Day by day Mr. Lewger set down what occurred, in his own handwriting, noting the occupations of the assembly men, whether they were absent or tardy and why. The book is still extant, the oldest relic of the official doings of the colony. Leonard Calvert himself gave testimony to his brother in a letter, of Mr. Lewger's worth, saying he was "a very serviceable and dilligent man in his secretaries place in Maryland."

By this time the Province had settlements not only around St. Mary's City, which was in the tract once called Augusta Carolina, but on the St. George's River and on the Patuxent. There were no courts, as yet, at least no records remain of them except of a warrant to hold one at Kent Island. There were hundreds, two of them, and St. Mary's County was either formed or forming. The county included everything, the hundreds being small settlements within it. St. Mary's Hundred was the settlement about the town, St. George's on the river by that name, only lately created a hundred, the writ creating a constable for it saying . . . "As the west side of St. George's River is now planted by several inhabitants it is thought fit to be erected into a hundred." The small settlement upon the Patuxent, Mattapany, was not yet large enough to be a hundred.

Such was the Province of Maryland when the Assembly of 1637 met, except that across the Bay, at Kent Island, there was insurrection. Claibourne's authority had been overthrown here and the commandant appointed by Leonard Calvert, Captain George Evilin, was finding it impossible to get the inhabitants to submit, peacefully, to the government of the Marylanders. The Isle of Kent was, as yet, neither county nor hundred but a separate government under a commandant of the Island who was empowered to hold court and to have a council just as Leonard Calvert the Governor was. The government at Kent was, however, subject to the principal government at St. Mary's. So far, Kent had not participated in the affairs of the Province.

With a new body of laws made, all ready for the Free Men to

agree to; with a commission to his brother the Governor to hold an Assembly so that the laws could be agreed to; with a sercetary to set down all things in order and make all things known to his Lordship, doubtless Lord Baltimore thought that now things would run smoothly in his Province and his right to say by what laws it should be governed would shortly be established for all time. But things were to turn out quite differently.

The writs sent out for this, Maryland's second assembly, were of two kinds. (18) One, special, to persons of importance, the other general, to all the Free Men. The very first entry made by Mr. Lewger in the book spoken of is the copy of one such writ, that sent to Captain George Evilin, a special writ. The writ orders him "all excuses set apart to make personal repair to the Fort of St. Marie's on the 25th day of January, 1637, then and there to consult and advise of the affairs of the Province." The writ also requires him to assemble all the Free Men of the Isle of Kent and to persuade such and so many of them as he should think fit to repair personally to the assembly and to give power and liberty to the other Free Men to be present if they so pleased. "And for so doing this shall be your warrant," the document ends. It was made out at St. Mary's, December 30, 1637, O. S.

The twenty-fifth day of January dawned and the Assembly became a fact. First came the Lieutenant-General, Leonard Calvert, Governor of the Province and his Lordship's representative, taking his place. Next came, seating themselves, his Council, consisting of Thomas Cornwalleys, Captain George Evilin, Commandant of the Isle of Kent, Mr. John Lewger, His Lordship's Secretary, Captain Robert Wintour. Jerome Hawley, who was entitled to sit in Council, was absent this first day, being in Virginia of which he was afterwards made treasurer.

The Council in their places let us turn our attention to the Free Men. They are well worth our attention, these Free Men of Maryland who are to make important history for the Province before this Assembly shall be dissolved. It would be delightful to linger over them, give their names and tell their occupations and the religion that each professed, reveal what we have learned of their ancestry and of their subsequent actions but space will

not permit. Ninety men there were, all told, to be reckoned with, and ninety men would take a deal of telling of!

They came from St. Marie's Hundred and St. George's just become a hundred; from Mattapanient on the Patuxent but sparsely settled, yet, and from that stormy petrel across the bay, the Isle of Kent. On this first day appeared from there only the member of the Council Captain Evilin, and Robert Philpot of the Council of the Isle of Kent who held proxies for the Free Men of the Island. It was Winter and passage across the bay difficult. Some would appear later on from there.

The Sheriff of St. Mary's County was there and the High Constable of St. George's Hundred. There were Free Men there, carpenters and masons, only lately become Free Men but taking their places beside the other Free Men, some of them the sons of baronets. There were those who bent the knee at Mass each Sunday morning at St. Mary's Chapel and there were those who believed (and said) that the Pope was Anti-Christ.

Planters they were, for the most part, as was fitting in a new land where food must be raised first of all, but one summoned by writ had been heir to a title he had relinquished for Holy Orders. Gentlemen and artisans, mariners and makers of ships to be navigated, carpenters of houses and builders of their chimneys and hearths, in they all streamed to the Fort of St. Mary's or gave excuse why they did not come each, were he Catholic priest or Protestant planter, son of baronet or "servant" lately become free, entitled to voice in his own right . . . a veritable Old-English *gemot*. But more than that, a New World assembly unlike all other New World Assemblies. In it Protestant and Catholic sat down together to deliberate, peacefully, over things for the common good.

It was small wonder that the Province had been secure from famine from the first. Of the ninety, forty-five were planters. More, for one could include in this category, justly, the Catholic priests of whom there were three, since their superior, Thomas Copley, he who was heir to a title, had with his patrimony brought in forty-eight men, including his fellow priests, thus entitling his order to 10,000 acres of land. (20) This land was taken up at St. Inigoes, and some of it, St. Thomas Manor, is still in possession

of the Jesuits, the oldest authorized religious foundation in the United States. Because of their plantations upon it the Jesuits were able to serve their people in Colonial times, spiritually, without taking salary or requiring, even, their keep. All three priests, being Free Men, were entitled to sit in the Assembly and were summoned there by writ.

A few of the Free Men seem to have been slackers. It is recorded against their names, in black and white that "they made neither appearance nor proxie." (21) It was proclaimed then, so careful did our forefathers seem to be about each man having his say, that "All Free Men who would clayme a voyce in this Assembly should come and make their clayme." Whereupon one John Robinson, "claymed" and was admitted. And at that the Assembly got down to business. It was ordered that the Governor as President of the Assembly, should appoint and direct all things that concern form and decency. "Then were certain orders established by general consent."

"Item. Everyone that is to speak to any matter shall stand up and be uncovered and direct the speech to the Lieutenant-General as President and if two or more shall stand up together the Lieutenant-General shall appoint who is to speak.

"Item. No man shall stand up to speak to any matter until the parties that spoke last before shall have sate down nor shall any one speak above once to one bill or matter at one reading nor shall refute the speech of any other with any uncivil or contentious terms nor shall name him but by some circumlocution. And if anyone offend to the contrary the Lieutenant-General shall compell him to silence.

"Item. The house shall sit every day at eight of the clock in the morning and at two of the clock in the afternoon.

"Item. The Free Men assembled at any time to any number above ten persons at the house aforesaid or within an hour afterwards shall be a house to all purposes.

"Item. Every one propounding any matter to the house shall digest it first into writing and deliver it to the secretary to be read unto the House.

"And it was ordered by the House that these orders should be

set up in some publick place of the House to the end that all men might take notice of them."

The Assembly, now ready to proceed to business, consisted altogether of about ninety men, that is of those who came or were summoned to come. Grouped according to hundreds there were fifty-six from St. Mary's; eighteen from St. George's; seven from Mattapanient, nine from the Isle of Kent. Grouped according to occupations there were besides the Governor and Council, the Sheriff, the two constables, of the Isle of Kent and of St. George's, three priests, ten gentlemen, three carpenters, a brick mason, five mariners, a cooper, forty-five planters and twelve others whose occupations are unknown.

On the second day special writs were sent to the three priests who had sent excuse on the first day. In response to this special summons they sent their man, Robert Clerke, Gentleman, asking that they be excused from sitting in the Assembly. "Which was admitted." Three months later their superior, Rev. Thomas Copley, wrote to Lord Baltimore explaining that they had not thought it "fit" to appear there in person. Thomas Copley was the one who gave up his title to become a priest.

On this second day arrived from across the bay John Lankford, High Constable of the Isle of Kent, revoking his proxy given to Robert Philpot and appearing for himself in person. This circumstance, of a free man revoking his proxie and appearing for himself, occurred several times during this Assembly. Proxies played an important part in the business of the Assembly. The number held by each Free Man who represented others than himself is carefully noted by Mr. Lewger in each setting down of the vote, the proxies counting as if the persons for whom they were cast were actually there and voting. The scene was set, the actors ready for what was to follow. The great work of the assembly was now about to be done.

The draft of laws composed by Lord Baltimore and sent over by him for the Free Men of Maryland to give their assent to was now brought forth. The twelve first acts were read to the House. What these acts were or, for that matter, what the whole code was, we do not know. No copy of Lord Baltimore's acts has ever been found so that we know less of them even, than we do of

the acts passed by our first Assembly, since we do know one act of theirs. That they were lacking in some way, as Colonial Laws, we glean from a chance remark in the letter alluded to before, that of Thomas Copley to Lord Baltimore. Referring to the laws Lord Baltimore had sent over he writes, that even the Governor and Mr. Lewger had said to him they were not fit for this colony. "For my own part," he adds, "seeing no service I could do your Lordship and many inconveniences I might run into by intermeddling I never as much as read them, neither do I yet know what they contained. (22) Which seems a pity, seeing that no other reference to them even has been found. The historian can not help wishing that the Father Copley had been of a more "intermeddling" turn of mind and had left us a record of what Lord Baltimore's laws dealt with.

In spite of the fact that the laws were read, it seems that some Free Men were late in getting there and others were still absent for it was ordered that those not appearing at the hours appointed should be "amerced" twenty pounds of tobacco for each default. "But for the present meeting" it is allowed, mercifully, "such as did appear, though tardy, should be pardoned the amercement but for the rest which appeared not it should stand." Perhaps being up and dressed and breakfasted and into St. Mary's Fort at "eight of the clock" on a January morning was something of a hardship, especially to those who lived across the river.

In the afternoon, when "two of the clock" sounded, in spite of the threat of amercement several were still absent. Captain Fleete spoke up for them that "there was no passing over the St. George's River." And they, too were excused. The St. George's River was the St. Mary's River. Whether it was ice or flood or lack of boats which kept the men from St. George's Hundred across the river away that day the record does not tell us, only that they could not come "for want of a passage over the St. George's River." The very next year a ferry was established.

On the third day, the twenty-ninth day of January, the question of the privileges of "parlement Men" was gone into, whether it extended to all the Free Men or only to those actually sitting. This meant, briefly, whether a Free Man could be arrested for debt while the Assembly was in session if, instead of sitting in

it he had given a proxy to some one else. It was decided that all Free Men were "Parlement Men" proxies or no. It would seem, by this action, that the fear of arrest hung heavy over some heads deliberating there. It did, as we shall see. In connection with the troubles on Kent Island warrants had been sworn out against some of its inhabitants for debts owed to a London firm. By deciding that giving a proxy did not take away a Free Man's privilege of being free from arrest during Assembly the persons of the men of Kent Island were safe during the session. Another from there, Edmund Parry, had arrived.

This settled, the question of Lord Baltimore's laws was taken up once more. It was proposed whether they should be read again, some of the Free Men contending that they had not been properly understood by all at their first reading. Immediately a counter proposition was made, namely, that they should be put to the vote without further reading.

Here a difference of opinion arose, Captain Cornwalleys saying that they should have "a more frequent house," Captain Fleete insisting that the laws should be read again. With Captain Fleete concurred four others who, with the proxies given to them made eighteen votes. For the counter proposition, that the laws should be put to the question at once without either "a more frequent house" or another reading, there were thirty-three votes, counting proxies.

The thirty-three votes carried the latter proposition, namely, that Lord Baltimore's laws be put to the vote of the Free Men. If they assented the laws would become the laws of the Province.

"Then were the laws put to the question whether they should be accepted as laws or not." It is recorded in careful and exact words.

"Yes!" votes the Governor, His Lordship's brother and the champion of his rights.

"Yes!" votes Mr. Lewger, His Lordship's Secretary, bearer and sharer of his plans. And, by the proxies given to them by other Free Men, these two votes counted as eighteen votes.

But what says the rest of the Assembly? These men had made a set of laws themselves, sitting in General Assembly. They had passed them and had submitted them to His Lordship for assent,

setting them as their will as to how they would be governed. And, for their pains, His Lordship had put his veto upon them and made their efforts nil. Should they now submit to having these over-seas laws made the code of their beloved Maryland? Their answer is simple, laconic, final. Mr. Lewger could and did set it down in eight short words.

"Denyed by all the rest of the Assembly." he wrote, when they had voted. And stopped for there was no more to say!

The House might not have been as "frequent" as some could have wished it to be but those who were there knew their own minds. Even the Governor's Council upon which, most likely, he relied to vote with him and so uphold his brother's rights took its stand solidly against him. There is no mistaking the tenor of that short and pregnant sentence written down for all generations of Marylanders to read and delight in: "Denyed by all the rest of the Assembly," the Free Men declaring, en masse, that they will not be governed by any laws but their own.

Even after the lapse of nearly three hundred years one can feel, reading the ancient record, the hush that fell in St. Mary's Fort that moment, the sudden sense of Rubicon crossed, of new turn to be taken now that His Lordship was defied. They were making history, that winter day, little as they suspected it, those Free Men of Maryland, stamping their mould on the minds of men as yet unborn, sowing seed that would bear fruit in another great moment as yet undreamed of.

For one hundred and thirty-eight years afterwards, on July 6, 1776, the Freemen of Maryland then sitting in General Assembly at Annapolis, rose up and declared that . . . "to regulate their internal polity and government the people of this colony have ever considered as their inherent and inalienable right," and England having attempted to interfere with it, "we have thought proper to call a new convention for the purpose of establishing a government in this colony" . . . the beginning of the Maryland Free State! (23) So does precedent produce history and independence beget independents! But to return to the assembly of which we were speaking.

After this terse writing down of a tremendous decision arrived

at the record becomes more wordy, goes on conversationally, as if everyone there had drawn a breath of relief.

"Then, question being moved what lawes the Province should be governed by, it was said by some that they might doe well to agree upon some lawes till we could heare from England againe. The President (Leonard Calvert denying any such power to be in the House, Captain Cornwalleys proposed the lawes of England. The President acknowledged that the Commission [brought him by Mr. Lewger] gave him power in civill causes to proceed by the lawes of England and in criminall causes likewise, not extending to life and member. But in those he was limited to the lawes of the Province. There could be no punishment inflicted on any enormous offenders by the refusall of these lawes." (24) Whereupon, to clinch his argument, he produced his commission.

It was examined, carefully. The assembly had put itself into a dilemma and had to find a way out. But Leonard Calvert's Commission did not solve the difficulty. "& upon reading it" Mr. Lewger notes, "it appeared that there was no power in the Province to punish any offence deserving losse of life or member for want of lawes." Deadlock!

This was no academic question, with these men. "Enormous offences" had been committed within the Province by Claybourne's followers who would not admit Lord Baltimore's jurisdiction. Seditious behavior was still going on there, across the bay in the Isle of Kent. And now, it turned out, with Lord Baltimore's code "denyed" there was no law whatever in the Province to apply to these insurgents. But a suggestion was made.

"Such enormous offences could hardly be committed without mutinie," it was pointed out, "& then it might be punished by martiall law," a complete taking over of law and punishment into the hands of the colony itself! That they felt this way their next move proves conclusively. It was proposed that committees be chosen to make a new draft of laws. By this action it is apparent that "till we can heare from England" meant only one thing in their minds, till we hear that Lord Baltimore assents to laws which we intend to make ourselves! Of ten names submitted five were decided upon for the Committee.

The names of these five men, who were courageous enough to

undertake to make laws for Maryland in the face of Lord Baltimore's disapproval, ought to be engraven on every Marylander's memory. They were Leonard Calvert, Thomas Cornwalleys, Captain Wintour, Captain Evelin and Justinian Snow.

And so this day, too, came to an end, this historic third day of the Assembly. It had begun by proposing to have read and considered the body of Lord Baltimore's laws. It finished by appointing a committee to draft a new body of laws to take their place so concluding, for all time, Lord Baltimore's contention that he had the right to make laws for Maryland. Not so small a thing to have accomplished between sun-up and sun-down! Since court was to be held on the third day of February to see what could be done about the Kent Islanders the Assembly was adjourned until sitting of the Provincial Court of Maryland. What was done will be told of directly.

The eighth of February came and the Assembly sat again. It was moved whether the former draft of laws, because of misunderstanding about them, should be read again which was affirmed by forty-eight votes and "denyed" by twenty-one votes. Order was made about the reading of new bills and how they were to be put before the House, that all bills proposed for laws should be read three times on three separate days before being voted. The draft of Lord Baltimore's laws were then read through the second time and there were read, also twenty new bills for the first time. Evidently the committee had made good use of its time. Incidentally, His Lordship's laws seem never to have come to a third reading. We hear no more of them.

On the afternoon of this day the President said he thought it fitting to adjourn until the new laws were all ready. "In the meantime," he said, "the company might attend to their other businesses &" And at that the doughty Captain Thomas Cornwalleys, was on his feet, demanding to know "upon what better business could they be engaged than upon this their country's good?" And another added this voice to the Captain's asking for what reason they should be adjourned, saying that they were willing to leave their other businesses for this. But the President, knowing what was in his mind but keeping silence a moment

longer, replied that "he was accomptable to no man for adjourning it."

Back on his feet was Cornwalleys again. Adjournment he could not prevent, if the Governor decreed it, but inaction he could and would if it were humanly possible. He moved that at least a committee be selected to prepare laws until they came together again. And being put to the house it was agreed that such committee be elected. Which was done, the committee consisting of the Governor, Cornwalleys and Captain Evelin. This point gained, no more obstructions were made and the Governor adjourned the House until February 26. He exhibited, then, a Commission to Mr. Lewger to convene the Assembly in case the Governor should not have returned to St. Mary's by then. He had business on hand for the Province.

It was a serious affair, this business of the Governor's that called him away from St. Mary's even though the Assembly was in session—nothing less than the continued insurrection on the Ile of Kent. Captain Evelin had not succeeded, while Commandant, in enforcing order there, the Governor would have to do it himself, in person. It was because of these continued troubles in Kent that Court had been convened for the third of February.

Besides the warrants for debts against some men of Kent there had been issued other warrants. Against John Boteler, Thomas Smith and Edward Beckler of the Island, directing that they be kept "in safe custody without bale or mainprize." Directing the constable also to "have them before me (Leonard Calvert) at St. Mary's with all convenient speed there to answer the several crimes of sedition and murther . . . objected against them severally." (25) But when court had convened on February 3, the accused had not been brought to St. Mary's. No arrests having been made there was no one to proceed against so Court, too, was adjourned and reconvened on February 12.

The Provincial Court was composed of the Governor, Leonard Calvert, who was judge, Secretary Lewger and Captain Wintour. At the session on February 12, something definite was done about the troubles in Kent. The Sheriff was directed to impanel a jury, called a "Grand Enquist" consisting of twenty-four Free Men, with Marmaduke Snow as foreman. This jury was sworn "truly

to enquire and tru presentment to make of all such evidence as should be given them. Said enquist to be made . . ." and the matter to be inquired into follows. (26) Whether in the troubles between the Kent Islanders and the Marylanders which led to battle in which a Marylander, William Ashmore, lost his life and three Kent Islanders, Warren Ratcliffe and two of his crew, were killed, Claybourne was not the real instigator and how much of the guilt lay with one Thomas Smith of the Ile of Kent. Pressing questions which were to lead to indictments and trials, later.

After impaneling the jury and swearing in witnesses the Court resolved itself back into a Council, the Council deciding that that the Governor ought to set out for Kent Island in person taking with him "Free Men well armed" and by force, if necessary, and by martial law bringing the inhabitants to order. To this document are affixed the signatures of Jerome Hawley, John Lewger and the Governor's own. Thomas Cornwalleys was one of those who were to accompany the Governor.

Out of this expedition of Leonard Calvert to the Ile of Kent was to come a trial for murder and a sentence to death, because of it, Maryland's first "Grand Enquist" was called, The Ile of Kent became, after it was finished, part of the Province of Maryland actually as well as theoretically. It is time, therefore, to tell something of the troubles in Kent Island which led to its being undertaken.

It is impossible to more than touch upon the reasons for them, here. Claybourne had objected to Lord Baltimore's claim to Kent Island, contending that his grant specified "uninhabited land" and that Kent Island was already inhabited by him and was not included. Claybourne was a man of standing and consequence in Virginia. After obtaining a license to trade with the Indians he had established a trading station upon Kent Island before the Maryland Colonists arrived. Kent Island was considered as being in Virginia by him and a burgess from the Island had sat in the Virginia Assembly. However, Lord Baltimore's grant, being for land on both sides of the Chesapeake, included Kent Island, a point Claybourne was unwilling to concede.

In the instructions given him Lord Baltimore had told his brother to notify Claybourne as soon as the Maryland colonists

had arrived that he, (Claybourne) was within the confines of the Maryland Province and that, therefore, he was under the necessity of taking out a patent for the land he occupied on Kent Island from Lord Baltimore and of paying him quit rent. (27) If Claybourne did not comply the Governor was to wait a year before taking any other action. The specified year was up in the Spring of 1635.

Other points of law than that it was "uninhabited land" were involved in the controversy, points which must be kept in mind if one wishes to understand the whole Claybourne affair, if indeed it can ever be wholly understood, but this and the way Claybourne got his license to trade are sufficient for the present article, will be all that are dealt with here.

Kent Island was merely a Trading Station. Claybourne had not taken up nor been given any special grant of land for it, believing himself entitled to settle there as, originally, it was part of the land granted for Virginia. His license to trade with the Indians, however, was obtained, not from Virginia but under the signet of Scotland. Instead of starting a plantation on the Island Claybourne had gone into partnership with a London firm, Cloberry and Company. This firm sent out supplies and took, in exchange, the results of trading. Such was the situation when the Marylanders arrived at St. Mary's.

The year being up without compliance on Claybourne's part Leonard Calvert decided to act. In April, 1635, he sent Captain Cornwalleys and a crew of men to search Maryland waters for traders without a Maryland license. Cornwalleys seized the goods of a trader named Harmon, who was operating under a license from Claybourne and seized a vessel, the Long Tail, belonging to the latter.

In return Claybourne sent out the Cockatrice, commanded by Lieutenant Ratcliffe Warren and thirteen men, to recover his vessel. The two parties met in the Pocomoke River on April 23, there was a battle and loss of life on both sides, Warren and two of his men, belonging to Claybourne's expedition being killed, as was William Ashmore, a Marylander. Later, on May 10, Cornwalleys met Thomas Smith, of Kent Island, trading under Claybourne's license and took him prisoner. Cornwalleys confiscated

his ship also but gave him a canoe in which to return to Kent. Once there, Smith, as we have seen, continued to rebel against the idea that the Ile of Kent was under Lord Baltimore's jurisdiction.

Money troubles followed upon the loss of vessels belonging to Kent Island. Claybourne's partners, Cloberry and Company, sent out an agent, George Evelin, to attach Claybourne's property in Virginia for debt. Having done this Evelin went on to Maryland and dropped in on the Governor. He was shown Lord Baltimore's papers and became convinced that The Ile of Kent was in Maryland, not Virginia. It was then that Leonard Calvert made him Commandant of Kent and sent him to the Island to put it in order, with what result we have seen. Captain Evelin had not been able to secure the arrest of those guilty of the seditions there. What he accomplished there is told in a letter written to his brother, the Proprietor, two months later. (26) He says, in this letter that he had started for the Island, to set it in order, in November and after being a week upon the water was forced to turn back because of the winds and weather, finally making the expedition in February, in the middle of the sitting of the Assembly.

We discover from this letter that Claybourne had already settled himself upon another island in the Chesapeake, Palmer's Island, which he had bought from the Indians believing that that, at least, was well out of Lord Baltimore's grant of land. He and his followers, Thomas Smith among them, had fortified themselves here, bringing cattle and preparing to settle down. Claybourne's brother-in-law, Boteler, was also in league with him against Lord Baltimore.

Not to go into too many details, Leonard Calvert reached Claybourne's stronghold, took Smith and Boteler prisoners and, by proclamation, declared a general pardon for all submitting themselves to his authority within twenty-four hours. The two prisoners were sent to St. Mary's in the Pinace and while waiting for it to return the Governor held court and decided various causes, at the end of court assembling the Free Men to choose delegates for the Assembly then going on.

He impressed upon the inhabitants the necessity of taking out

patents in Lord Baltimore's name under the Great Seal of the Province and promised to come back in the Spring with Mr. Lewger and have the land surveyed for them and the grants passed. An index to the possible population of Kent Island at that time, is given by the fact that Governor Calvert found upon it one hundred and twenty men capable of bearing arms. Upon Palmer's Island, Claybourne's second place of settlement, a Fort was erected by the Marylanders as the result of this expedition, Fort Conquest.

In the meantime, back in St. Mary's City, the Assembly had been convened by Lewger on the twenty-sixth of February and again on the fifth of March, it being adjourned each time without transacting any business. March 12 was set as the next date.

The Governor had returned by the twelfth and the Assembly convened and proceeded to business. The twenty new bills which had already been read once were given their second reading. On March 13, fourteen other new bills were read for the first time. On the fourteenth, the third day after the Governor's return, three new bills were brought in, one of them being a bill for "The Attainder of William Claybourne, Gent."

Claybourne, who had gone to Virginia following his troubles upon Kent Island, had subsequently been sent to England by Governor Harvey and was there at the moment making petition to the King for redress. It was therefore not possible for the Assembly to proceed against him in person so they brought in a bill of attainder by which his property became forfeit to the Lord Proprietor.

Thomas Smith, however, was in St. Mary's, a prisoner sent there by the Governor himself, as was also Boteler, Claybourne's brother-in-law. Smith could be tried in person and he was, on the afternoon of this momentous day, March 14. As there were no laws to try him by the whole Assembly had to concur in the proceedings, which they did, becoming by that action a High Court of Justice with the Governor acting as judge. The Secretary, Mr. Lewger, made himself attorney for His Lordship, being careful first to exhibit and read the warrant from Lord Baltimore which made this act of his legal.

Thomas Smith was called to the bar, the indictment against him was read and he pleaded not guilty. The attorney (Mr. Lewger)

informed the House upon the indictment and produced the depositions of two men. The prisoner then pleaded all he had to say in his defence and the attorney replied. "And when the prisoner had no more to allege for himself he was demanded whether he would challenge any in the House that were to pass upon him and he challenged none." So vote was taken and he was pronounced guilty. This done the Governor read the sentence of death, not as coming from himself but from all the Free Men. The sentence which the Governor read stipulated expressly that the Free Men had tried Smith in the General Assembly, had found him guilty and had sentenced him to death. The sentence was for death by hanging and confiscation of Smith's goods to the Lord Proprietary. (36) While the sentence was carried out Smith's estate was not forfeited to the Proprietor but was allowed to be kept by his widow for the use of her female children.

The sentence, thus pronounced, was affirmed and approved by special consent by word of mouth; some seventeen Free Men signing their names as token of such consent. After judgment the prisoner "demanded his clergy" but was told by the governor that "Clergy could not be allowed in the crime (that being English law) and if it might just now it was demanded too late after judgment." In one of the bills passed at this session, a bill to allow clergy to some capital offenses, one can catch sight of the struggle this demand caused the Free Men; on the one hand, the necessity of conforming, somewhat, to English law, on the other, their own wishes and good feeling.

Smith's indictment, by a mischance, was never copied into the records. Mr. Lewger recorded the first of the indictments brought in by the Jury, and then, thinking he was recording Smith's indictment, began copying it over again. Seeing his mistake, he underlined what he had written, noting that it had been copied by mistake but did not copy Smith's indictment. So we do not know, from record, just what was Thomas Smith's share in the disorders on Kent Island and his sentence to death appears arbitrary to some.

When Smith's trial and sentencing were over it was moved, by the attorney, that the House make "enquist" into the killing of William Ashmore. Captain Cornwalleys and other interested

parties having been excused from the room witnesses were sworn in and testimony taken. It was found, after deliberation, that

"Lieutenant Ratcliffe Warren, John Bellson and William Dawson with divers others, did assault the peace of Captain Cornwalleys and his company, feloniously and as pyrates and robbers to take said vessels, [The St. Margaret and the St. Helen, in which were Cornwalleys and his company] and did discharge divers pieces charged with bullets and shott against the said Thomas Cornwalleys and his company. . . . Wherefore the said Thomas Cornwalleys and his company, in defence of themselves and safeguard of their lives, not being able further to fly from them, after warning given to the assailants to desist from assaulting them at their own peril, did discharge some gunnes upon the said Ratcliffe Warren and his Company of which shotts the said Ratcliffe Warren, John Bellson and William Dawson died. And so . . . they do acquit the said Thomas Cornwalleys and his company of the death of [the three before named] and they further find that the said Ratcliffe Waren and his company did discharge their gunnes against the said Thomas Cornwalleys and his company and . . . did kill the said William Ashmore as felons, pyrates and murthers."

On the next day a bill was brought in for confirming Smith's sentence of death and read for the first time. The bill for the attainder of Claybourne was read for the second time on this day. The latter bill, for Claybourne's attainder, was read four times altogether, before the session of the Assembly drew to a close. It was engrossed on parchment and affirmed and signed by Leonard Calvert and the Free Men assembled and copied into the records in full.

From these records it was sent to England and placed among the State papers in London in the State Paper Office. The older law, that passed on February 26, 1635, is incorporated into it, a law providing that "felonies, pyracies and murthers" shall be punished in Maryland as is usual in England . . . the only piece of information that Marylanders have about their First General Assembly. (31) One can see, in this early law, the effort of the Free Men to conform as nearly as possible to English law, the instance of poor Thomas Smith and his appeal for clergy being

another example of the same thing — the Free Men feeling somewhat bound by the customs of the Mother Country, for the time being.

While these things were being done in Maryland, Claybourne was not idle in England. In his petition to the king about his two trading stations, one at Kent and the other at the mouth of the Susquehanna, he offered to pay one hundred pounds sterling, annually, to be allowed to remain upon them, asking, at the same time, for an additional grant of land to run northward towards the Hudson. Knowledge of the topography of America was in a misty state, as this petition proves. The king referred Claybourne's petition to the Lord Commissioners for Plantations. They brought in their opinion, April 4, 1638, three weeks to the day upon which the bill for Claybourne's attainder had been first read in the Maryland Assembly. (32)

Their opinion was that Claybourne's Commission to trade with the Indians, obtained under the signet of Scotland, was good only for such places as had not been formerly granted by His Majesty to any other. "Which Commission did not extend to the Ile of Kent or to plant or to trade there or in any other place or places within Lord Baltimore's Province. Wherefore . . . the right and title to the Ile of Kent (was) to be absolutely his with no planting or trading with the Indians within its precincts without license from him." (Lord Baltimore).

This effectively settled the question. Proclamation was made in Virginia next October by the Governor, with the Assembly concurring, prohibiting "all persons inhabiting within Virginia to trade with the Indians within the Province of Maryland without license to trade from Lord Baltimore.

On March 17 a curious question was brought up but defeated. it was "for the resting of servants on Saturday afternoon." "No such custom to be allowed" was the terse answer to this seemingly modern measure. On the twenty-fourth, the last day of the session, Thomas Bradnock, the first real burgess to sit in the Assembly, arrived from the Ile of Kent, accompanied by Edward Beckler of the same place. Among the bills brought before this Assembly, some have interesting titles, considering the proceedings of the Assembly, as for instance, the bill entitled "For Al-

lowing Clergy to Some Captital Offences" and, "For Arbitrary Punishment of Some enormous Offences." Although the whole body of bills has not been preserved, the titles have and are worth attention for curiosity's sake. There are too many to do more than touch on the more curious ones, such as the one for the "Settling of the Gleb," "For Restraint of Liquors," for the "Bounding of Manors." Nor were the people forgotten, for we find a bill entitled "For the Liberties of the People," one for "The Probate of Wills," "Touching General Assemblies."

All these bills were "engrossed," whether on parchment, as was the bill for Claybourne's attainder, or not, the record does not say. On Saturday, March 24, being the last day of the week and the last day of the year, also, the twenty-fifth being Lady Day and New Year's, the Assembly came to an end. "In the morning one part and in the afternoon the residue of the lawes as they were faire engrossed were read in the house and after the reading of them the Governor signed them and so did the rest of the House. And the House was dissolved." So did the historic assembly, so fraught with precedents that last even to our own times, pass into history. Almost the last thing to be recorded was the bill for Claybourne's attainder, after having passed to its fourth reading.

The bills though "faire engrossed" and read and signed never became laws because when they were sent to Lord Baltimore he refused his assent to one and all of them. Although their code had been rejected, for the second time, by the Proprietary, the Free Men of Maryland had won the point for which they had fought. On August 21, 1638, Lord Baltimore made out a new commission for the governor, Leonard Calvert. By this the Governor was enabled to assent, in the name of his brother, the Proprietary, to laws made by the Free Men themselves. Always provided such laws be "as near as conveniently may be agreeable to and not contrary to the laws of England. Every law so assented to by you in my name and consented to by the Free Men I do hereby declare shall be in force within the Province till I or my heirs shall signify my disassent. . . ." To provide for laws to be so assented to another assembly was called for the following February.

This Assembly, Maryland's third, marks a change. The writs sent out, calling it for the twenty-fifth day of February were

different from those sent out for the preceding Assembly. Instead of every Free Man being asked to assemble the Free Men were commanded to meet and elect two or more burgesses for the General Assembly. Mr. Fulk Brent and Mr. Giles Brent were added to the Council which still sat with the Assembly in one House.

On the very first day of this Assembly Lord Baltimore's letter was read giving them permission to make their own laws, etc. The first business taken up after that was an act for the settling of the Assembly by the general consent of all the Free Men and of the Lieutenant General.

The General Assembly was to consist of "Everyone being of the Council of the Province and any other gentleman of able judgment and quality, summoned by writ and the Lord of every manor within the Province after manors be erected. And every hundred was to elect and choose some one, two or more able and sufficient men for the General Assembly."

Next an act was passed confirming the elections of the delegates then sitting and the constitution of the Assembly itself, there having been no law on the subject when the elections for burgess took place. Settled: that the Assembly could only proceed to business when twelve or more were present, the Governor and his Secretary making two of the twelve.

But in spite of the act to confirm the elections of burgesses Cuthbert Fenwick, of St. Mary's Hundred "claymed voyce as not assenting to the election of St. Mary's burgesses" and was admitted. Robert Clerke, of the same Hundred did the same thing. These two, sitting for themselves, in addition to the burgesses for St. Mary's, present a curious anomaly. The feeling that he ought to give "voyce" for himself alone died hard in the early Maryland Free Man!

Mattapanient had become a Hundred and there was another Hundred, St. Michael's Hundred. And, for the first time there is mention of recompense being made burgesses to the two Burgesses from Kent who had an authentic paper, reading, "Know all men by these presents that we, the Free Men of the Ile of Kent whose names are underwritten, have elected and chosen our loved friend, Nicholas Brown, planter, to be our burgess during the next General Assembly in our name to assent to all and only such things as our

burgess shall think fit thereby giving as full and free consent to all causes and matters whatsoever which in the said assembly shall be agreed and concluded as if we, ourselves in person had consented thereto." Then follow twenty-four names for Nicholas Brown and twenty-four names for the other Burgess, Christopher Thomas.

The first act passed by this assembly, after settling the mode of the Assembly itself, was "Holy Church within the Province shall have all her rights, liberties and immunities, safe, whole and inviolable." As there was dispute as to which Church constituted "Holy Church" a later Assembly declared that every Church professing to believe in Jesus Christ shall be "Holy Church" within the Province.

The manner of making a bill into a law was decided at this assembly. It was decreed, "After any bill was read in the House it should be read, ingrossed or utterly rejected. And all bills ingrossed shall be put to the question and such as are assented to by the greater number of Free Men . . . shall be undersigned," "The Free Men have assented." And after the President shall be demanded his assent in the name of the Lord Proprietor and if his assent be to the bill, it shall be undersigned by the Secretary in these words, "The Lord Proprietor willeth that this be a law."

And so, at last, after three abortive attempts, came law for the Province of Maryland. Duly consented to, properly "undersigned" law that no man could, rightfully, gainsay. And with this Assembly which did these things, the government of Maryland can be said to have crystalized into shape. There would be change, of course, the Assembly would be divided into an upper and lower House. Counties would spring up and bring their own judicial problems and machinery. But the groundwork was laid. Even so early as this third Assembly County courts with provisions for the settling of civil and criminal cases were established, Justices of the Peace were provided for, a clerk for the court, all foreshadowings of the complicated legal system of Maryland today.

In this sketch is set down, from the records themselves, the beginning of Maryland's government, her first Assemblies and courts; the appointment of her first "Conservator of the Peace," of her first sheriff, her first constable. Pictured here is the first

case in which the "Attorney for His Lordship," forerunner of the State's Attorney of today, indicts a prisoner; the first sentence to death in Maryland as it was pronounced in court by Maryland's first Governor, Leonard Calvert, the sentence itself growing out of the only act that we know of passed by the first Assembly of all.

Much that is modern is foreshadowed by the actions of these, Maryland's first Free Men. One thought it unseemly for himself, a priest and his fellow priests, to mingle and meddle in politics. and in 1867, when the Constitution of Maryland was written it was enacted by Section 7 "That no minister or preacher of the gospel or teacher of any religious creed . . . shall be eligible as senator or delegate."

Governor Calvert, harassed by the seditions on Kent Island calls a "Grand Enquist" to deal with the offenders and the Constitution provides, in Secton 20, that "The House of Delegates may inquire on the oath of witnesses, into all . . . offenses as the grand inquest of the State and may commit any person for any crime to the public jail . . ." a precedent that strikes Marylanders with particular force today when such a "Grand Inquest" actually sat in the Spring of 1929, at Annapolis, to inquire into a public scandal.

Much of the first work of the Free Men was impermanent, of course, Hundreds have long since disappeared as divisions and manors, with their courts, baron and leet, have come to mean only a beautiful old house set upon flowing acres. "Settling of the Glebe" is enough to send even a Marylander scurrying to the dictionary to learn that it meant, merely, a setting aside of land on which a clergyman should dwell.

But for what was permanent, their persistent belief and more persistent action founded upon that belief, that they, the Free Men alone, should and would have the right to make their own laws we, of today, thank them in the name of that State of which we are so proud to be natives, the Maryland Free State.

REFERENCES

(1) Woodrow Wilson, "History of the American People." Vol 1, pp. 57-58.

(2) Hannis Taylor, "Origin and Growth of the English Constitution," Vol. 1, pp. 24-31.

(3) Bacon's Laws.

(4) Encyclopaedia Britannica article, "Palatine."

(5) Calvert Papers, Maryland Historical Society Fund. Publication 35; Paper No. 3.

(6) Relatio Itineris Fund. Pub. No. 7.

(7) Hannis Taylor, "Origin and Growth," etc. Vol. II, pp. 162-167.

(8) Calvert Papers, Vol. 1, Paper 1, Fund. Pub. 28, P. 1-31.

(9) Archives of Maryland (printed) Records of Provincial Court, p. 35.

(10) Johnson, "Foundation of Maryland," Fund. Pub. No. 18, p. 31.

(11) Calvert Papers, Fund. Pub. No. 28, p. 172.

(12) Archives of Maryland (printed) Proceedings of the Provincial Council, p. 47.

(13) Relatio Itineris, Fund. Pub. No. 35.

(14) William Hand Browne, "History of a Palatinate," Streeter, Fund. Pub. No. 9, p. 7.

(16) Archives of Maryland. Proceedings of the Council, p. 50.

(17) Streeter, "History of Maryland," Fund. Pub. No. 9, p. 218.

(18) Archives of Maryland. Proceedings of the Assembly (printed).

(19) Archives of Maryland. Proceedings of the Assembly, Fund. Pub.

(20) Land Records, Annapolis. Streeter, Fund. Pub. No. 9, p. 98.

(21) Archives of Maryland. Proceedings of Assembly.

(22) Calvert Papers, Fund. Pub. No. 28, p. 158.

(23) *Maryland Journal and Advertiser,* July 11, 1776.

(24) Proceedings of the Assembly.

(25) Proceedings of the Provincial Court.

(26) Proceedings of the Provincial Court.

(27) Calvert Papers, Fund. Pub. No. 28, Vol. 1, Paper 1.

(28) Calvert Papers, Fund. Pub. No. 28, p. 182.

(29) Archives of Maryland (printed). Proceedings of the Assembly.

(30) *Maryland Historical Mag.,* Vol. 15, p. 231. Percy Skirvin, "Seven Pioneers of Eastern Shore."

(31) Colonial papers. Proceedings of the Assembly. Maryland Archives.

(32) Archives of Maryland. Proceedings of the Council (Colonial Paper).

(33) Proceedings of the Assembly. Maryland Archives (printed).

TWO PIONEER RUSSIAN MISSIONARIES

Thomas F. Meehan

As Russia runs largely in the news of the day, it is of interest to note that the Mother Elizabeth Galitzin who was prominent in connection with the founding of the first Sacred Heart convent in New York, was a Russian princess. Her mother, the Countess Protasof, was the friend, called "my second conscience" of the famous Madame Swetchine. Both mother and daughter became converts from the Orthodox Greek Church. Elizabeth joined the Religious of the Sacred Heart in 1826. In 1839 she was elected Assistant General and made Visitor of the convents in the United States. Her sister Religious, the late Mother Janet Stuart, says of her in the memoir she contributed to "The Catholic Encyclopedia":

"Mother Galitzin carried out her duties of Assistant General and Visitor in a characteristic spirit. Though burning with ardor to attain the best in all religious perfection, her strict ideas of government and the tendency to dissimulation which autocratic natures sometimes reveal in the pursuit of their ends, prevented her from acquiring fully the spirit of the Constitutions of her Order . . . Conscious of the harm she had done in pressing the matter of some changes in the Constitutions Mother Galitzin begged to be sent back to the United States to restore the original organization of the Society. In the midst of an outbreak of yellow fever in Louisiana she nursed the sick with heroic devotedness until she was herself struck down and died (Dec. 8, 1843)."

Another Russian, and one of her relatives, Prince Demetrius A. Gallitzin, followed Father Louis Sibourd, as a pioneer missionary of the Allegheneys. His "parish" included what is now the dioceses of Pittsburgh and Erie and a large part of that of Harrisburg. It may be noted incidentally that Lewis H. Stephens, who was born at Loretto, Pennsylvania, in 1828 and who died at Altoona during the first week of 1924, was the last living person Father Gallitzin baptized. It may also be noted that the missionary spelled his name with ll. As he died, at Loretto, May 6,

1840, Mother Galitzin did not meet him as she expected when she arrived here.

When she first came to New York she was the guest of the Sisters of Charity at the old St. Peter's convent in Barclay street. She was an artist, so in token of her appreciation of the hospitality of the Sisters she painted three pictures for them during her stay, which are now preserved at the College of Mount Saint Vincent-on-Hudson. A volume of her letters to her mother gives some very entertaining glimpses of that period. Writing on September 1, 1840, she says:

"I arrived at New York a few hours ago after a voyage of forty-five days. We had neither storms nor rough weather; the trip was a long one that is all. . . . I was sea-sick only one week; after that so well that I passed a great part of the time in drawing."

She goes on to say that with her seven companions she expects to start in four days for "St. Louis in the State of Missouri, 2,000 verst from New York. They say that we shall reach there in twelve days . . . I believe that I shall die of joy when I get there; for here in the midst of the world, though surrounded by excellent people, who show us a thousand attentions, I am like a fish out of water."

A letter from St. Louis dated November 9, tells her mother:

"Write me now at St. Louis at the Academy of the Ladies of the Sacred Heart, for so they call here those religious houses which receive pupils as boarders . . .

"It is too true that our 'American uncle' is dead. You may suppose how deeply I regret it. He was not a Bishop; only a simple missionary . . . The whole country in which he preached the Gospel weeps for him as for a father. His memory is revered in America among Protestants as well as Catholics."

And in writing again from New York on May 15, she adds:

"You have no idea how deeply our 'relative' is regretted here. He was universally loved and respected. People look upon me with favor because I bear the same name."

After remaining in Missouri and Louisiana for several months Mother Galitzin returned to New York in May, 1841, to arrange for the new foundation of the Religious of the Sacred Heart Bishop Hughes wished to have located there. This is what she

thinks of New York as she found it, June 20, 1841, while staying with the Sisters of Charity at the old St. Peter's Convent in Barclay Street:

"The climate of New York is very disagreeable. It was so cold yesterday that even with a woolen coverlid I had hard work to keep warm through the night. It is not cold two days in succession. The temperature varies even between morning and evening, that is when it is not continually raining. I believe, after all, that the climate of St. Petersburg is the best. Our summers at least are superb, and we have long days, but here it is hardly light this time of year, a half after four in the morning, and at half after seven in the evening we need lamps. In fact you must go to a cold climate if you want to keep warm and to see well!

"I have had an agreeable surprise here and you would never guess what it is. It is to have *kliouka* (cranberries) to eat nearly every day; it is the first time I have seen them since I left Russia. This is absurd I know, but I cannot tell you what pleasure it gave me. New York is an immense city; it has nearly 400,000 inhabitants and is as noisy as Paris. There are some 80,000 Catholics and only eight churches, but religion is making progress. The next time I write you it will be from our house of the Sacred Heart. I am burning with impatience to be in it; for though we are extremely comfortable with the good Sisters of Charity who are truly sisters to us we nevertheless long to be at home, where we can live in conformity to our Rule and customs."

During the following months the preparations for the New York convent progressed, and on August 1, she writes that she has "just opened a little mission among the Indian savages in Missouri, 300 miles from St. Louis," and she goes on to tell her mother:

"Don't be afraid of crocodiles. The country abounds with them, as it does in snakes; but nobody thinks of them and I have never even seen one. Several, however, have been pointed out to me; but as my eyes were cast down I saw nothing."

She follows, on September 13, with this statement about the New York convent:

"Our establishment is well under way; the house is finished and we have already twelve pupils. I have no doubt their num-

ber will increase next month to twenty and perhaps more for there have been already at least forty applications."

This was the establishment opened July 13, 1841, at Houston and Mulberry Streets, and which in August, 1844, was abandoned for a new site at Astoria, Long Island. It also proved unsatisfactory and a second change was made February 17, 1847, to Manhattanville.

When soon after this transfer from the unsatisfactory Long Island site to Manhattanville the first Mount Saint Vincent convent and school of the Sisters of Charity was located by Bishop Hughes in what is now the northeastern section of Central Park, then Yorkville, some timid souls thought the move would be detrimental to the prosperity of the Manhattanville institution. The astute Mother Hardey, however, saw the field was large enough for both and that in the work of saving souls it mattered not whether Sisters of Charity or Sisters of the Sacred Heart were to be the laborers.

The story went across the ocean to Paris and Mother Barat in alarm wrote to Mother Hardey:

"What is the meaning of this report which reaches me, my Daughter? Can it be possible that your Bishop, who has always been so devoted to your interests and who urged you to incur the great expense of your recent purchase, has established near Manhattanville a school similar to yours, and at a more moderate pension thus leaving you but little chance to prosper? I acknowlelge that I am greatly surprised at this unexpected turn of affairs. What will become of your establishment and what do you propose to do?"

Mother Hardey went direct to Bishop Hughes with the rumors, although they did not personally worry her, and on November 22, 1847, he wrote her a long letter in which, after assuring her of his friendship and favor for her and for her Community, he said:

"When Madame Galitzin arrived here it was deemed most expedient to commence in the city, and the price of tuition was put at a high rate, with a view at once to secure the attendance of what are called the better classes, and at the same time not to injure the other schools and not to provoke their hostility . . . As regards the existence of another school I persist still in the

opinion that it cannot interfere in any way with your success . . . Certainly, I would not sanction anything which I could reasonably suppose would be to your detriment. I think I may appeal to yourselves to say whether I have left anything undone since you have been in the diocese to aid you and to co-operate with you in the establishment of a religious educational institution, which has been already and I trust is still destined to be for many generations a blessing which the Catholic people are, alas! themselves but too slow to appreciate. Yet for my part I do not see the slightest reason for discouragement."

The splendid success since then attending both Mount Saint Vincent and Manhattanville and their present prestige as colleges for the higher education of women, are convincing testimony to the foresight and wisdom of Bishop Hughes and Mother Hardey.

GENERAL MEETING OF MAY 16, 1928

A facsimile of the oldest American book in existence and one of the very first printed in North America, "Doctrina Breve," printed in Mexico in 1544, was presented to His Eminence Cardinal Hayes by the United States Catholic Historical Society at the forty-fifth annual meeting of the Society held on Wednesday evening, May 16, 1928, in the ballroom of the Catholic Club, 120 Central Park South, New York. The book presented to the Cardinal was beautifully bound in cardinal red. Other specially bound volumes were prepared for presentation to His Holiness Pope Pius XI, and to Archer M. Huntington, through whose courtesy the United States Catholic Historical Society was able to restore this precious historic work to public circulation. The facsimile reproduction forms the tenth volume of the monograph series of HISTORICAL RECORDS AND STUDIES as issued by the United States Catholic Historical Society.

Thomas F. Meehan, the editor of HISTORICAL RECORDS AND STUDIES, in a foreword to the volume says that it had long been the desire of the Catholic Historical Society to reproduce in facsimile the oldest book printed in North America, the "Doctrina Breve," compiled by Bishop Juan Zumárraga and published by him in the City of Mexico in June, 1544. There is one perfect copy of this historic volume included among the treasures collected by Archer M. Huntington for the library of the Hispanic Society of America. Through the generosity of Mr. Huntington and the courtesy of the Hispanic Society of America the reproduction in facsimile of "Doctrina Breve" by the United States Catholic Historical Society was made possible. Mr. Huntington had photographic prints of each page made and presented to the United States Catholic Historical Society, and these prints were photo-engraved by a member of the society, Stephen H. Horgan, and a facsimile copy of this oldest production of the first printing press set up in the New World was produced.

The first printing press was sent from Spain at the instance of Bishop Zumárraga in 1536, and for seven or eight years before the printing of "Doctrina Breve" Bishop Zumárraga was publish-

ing little religious pamphlets, manuals of instruction, etc., but none of these are now in existence.

The meeting on May 16, at which the specially bound volume of the reproduction of "Doctrina Breve" was presented to Cardinal Hayes was attended by several hundred members and friends of the Historical Society. The beautiful ballroom of the Catholic Club was crowded to its capacity. Seated on the dais with the Cardinal were the Right Rev. Pascual Diaz, exiled Bishop from Mexico, who was also presented with a copy of the new work and Percy J. King, president of the United States Catholic Historical Society, who presided and introduced the formal speaker of the meeting, the Rev. F. X. Talbot, S.J., literary editor of *America,* who read the interesting historical paper on "Some New Data About Blessed Isaac Jogues," which is printed in another part of this volume of RECORDS AND STUDIES.

At the conclusion of Father Talbot's paper Thomas F. Meehan, editor of the Society's publications, handed President King the specially bound volume for Cardinal Hayes, and Mr. King in offering it to His Eminence, on behalf of the Society, said:

"Your Eminence, Right Reverend and Reverend Clergy and Ladies and Gentlemen:

"When the year 1544 was ushered in, the religious, social and political life of the Old World was in a ferment. Loyola and his followers were vigorously combating the attacks on the Church. England had definitely broken with Rome some years before, Cartier had completed his third voyage of discovery and DeSoto had reached the Mississippi River. It was over twenty years since Cortez, that intrepid soldier of fortune, one of the greatest of the Spanish Conquistadores, after innumerable hardships had conquered Mexico with a handful of indomitable men and made it a dependency of Spain, then in the plentitude of its power as one of the great European nations.

"During these years many adventurers had returned to Spain with their tales of marvelous cities, illimitable wealth and a mighty, if strange civilization, to fire the imagination, longing and zeal of a great company of ardent spirits, which the decay of chivalry had bereft of romantic ambitions. Some sought power and possessions for their sovereigns; some to gather the treasures which they confidentally believed awaited their coming, and others, de-

voted churchmen, crossed the Atlantic in company with these rovers, to extend the Heavenly Kingdom in the New World.

"Affairs had progressed to a point where organization had to be effected and authority placed over this widespread field so as to co-ordinate and sustain these missionaries in their work. So in 1528 Juan de Zumárraga, a Franciscan from the Basque Provinces, then head of a convent at Abrojo, was recommended as Bishop of Mexico. Owing to the necessities of the times he left for Mexico before his consecration and landed there in December, 1528. Then began for him a period of great difficulty and worry. Cortez had meanwhile left for Spain and with this strong spirit gone, certain persons sought unfortunately to exploit the country and its wealth and natives for their own aggrandizement. They were few in number but bold and aggressive and were vigorously and valorously opposed by the Bishop-elect until the return of Cortez as captain general when there ensued a period of peace and well being for the Bishop and his Indian flock.

"He was recalled to receive the purple and in 1533 was consecrated at Valladolid, Spain, the first Bishop of Mexico, returning the next year to begin a decade of unceasing labor for his diocese.

"The years since his first coming to the New World had seen a most fruitful harvest and with the apparition of Our Lady of Guadaloupe in 1531 a great wave of conversions spread over the country so that by 1536 it was estimated that 5,000,000 natives had been baptized.

"On his second voyage to Mexico Bishop Zumárraga brought with him a number of trained mechanics and six women teachers for the Indian girls. The community was now in a flourishing condition. Las Casas had obtained from Rome a model set of laws for the government of these people which went into effect in 1544 remedying certain injustices which had grown up in this new country owing to the unsettled and primitive conditions found in any new settlement.

"The Bishop's last few years were devoted to carrying out his numerous works of piety, benevolence and education, among the chief of which was the school for Indian girls, the famous Collegio Tlaltelolco, the introduction of the first printing press, the foundations of various hospitals in Mexico and Vera Cruz, and

the impetus he gave to industry, agriculture and manufacture, for which he induced trained mechanics and artisans to come from Spain and as the old chronicles say, 'the printing of many books.'

"For his great labors he was raised to the Archbishopric of Mexico, including the Suffragan sees of Oaxaca, Michoacan, Tlaxcala, Guatemala, and Cuidad Real de Chiapas, but death came to the Archbishop a month before the Bull from Rome reached him in 1548.

"Among other works produced by Bishop Zumárraga was a little volume of 167 pages measuring 4¼ by 6½ inches printed in Spanish in beautiful clear black letter, without folios, running heads or chapter captions. Its dedication inserted on the last page reads as follows:

" 'To the honor and praise of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Glorious Holy Virgin His Mother. It is for this that the present treatise is finished. The which was seen and examined and corrected by order of the Right Reverend Lord Bishop Juan Zumárraga, first Bishop of Mexico and of the Council of His Majesty. It was printed in the great City of Tenochtitlan, of Mexico, of this New Spain. And in this house of Juan Cromberger by order of the same Lord Bishop Zumárraga and at his cost. The printing was finished on the 14th June of the year 1544.'

"Just 384 years ago the original of this volume was laboriously printed in Mexico, ninety-five years before the first printed book in New England, a hymnal, was issued at Cambridge, Massachusetts, this 'Doctrina Breve,' this short Catechism as we would now call it, was examined, approved and issued by Bishop Zumárraga. Printing at that time was still a laborious, costly and highly specialized art and craft and the establishment of presses and manning them with master craftsmen from the Old World is but one evidence of the Bishop's far-reaching energy and broad vision. Full of zeal he sought in every way to help his beloved Indian flock, spreading peace, industry and culture by all the means at his command, setting an example of piety, wisdom and practicality, which his spiritual successors in that land have nobly followed to this day. This little book after many wanderings through the generosity of Archer M. Huntington is now in the New York Library of the Hispanic Society, and through the courtesy of Mr. Huntington and the Hispanic Society we have

been enabled to reproduce the facsimile edition under the devoted care and expert advice of Thomas F. Meehan and Stephen Horgan, both members of our society to whom our public thanks is due.

"Although a volume entitled 'The Spiritual Ladder' was printed in Mexico by the Dominicans for their novices in the Province of Mexico about 1638 no copy exists today so the 'Doctrina' is the oldest copy in existence of any book printed in North America. To complete the work and make it an historical entity we had the noted historian of the Spanish Missions, the Rev. Zephyrin Engelhardt, O.F.M., compile a brief history which has been included in our issue.

"Your Eminence, the United States Catholic Historical Society, knowing your interest in its labors felt that you would appreciate this volume as a memorial of a great and zealous Churchman, who only sought the country's good and the welfare of its people handing to his Episcopal successors a glorious heritage most nobly upheld, and we also most earnestly desired to show you our appreciation of your kindness and encouragement to our society, so with the issue of this, our latest and best work, we have had three volumes specially bound, one to be presented to His Holiness the Pope at Rome, one to Archer M. Huntington and the Hispanic Society in appreciation of all they did for us, and one with all our love and loyalty for you."

Mr. King then gave the copy bound in cardinal red to His Eminence and another in green to Bishop Diaz. Replying to Mr. King, the Cardinal said with manifest feeling:

Mr. President, Monseigneur, Reverend Fathers, and Members of the Historical Society:

"Whatever disposition I may have had not to say anything of course, quickly disappeared when I found the President making his address and bringing in the reference to myself. Then when he presented me with this wonderful book, a volume especially prepared for me, I naturally must say something, as if I would not have said something, anyway.

"I am very, very happy to be here tonight. I always look forward to these meetings because I have never attended one of these meetings that I have not felt pleased. I have admired,

especially, the spirit of those who are responsible for the work being done, work most fruitful. And I therefore step out of a very busy life of the outside, I might say, to the atmosphere of the library, the atmosphere of the cloister, of one of the old monasteries. From there I feel that I cannot escape the sense of the culture of the Church of God. Of course, it is a spiritual culture, where everything is done in the way of inspiration.

"And so tonight I am delighted, Mr. President, with all here present, to find myself with you and to have had the privilege of listening to that very inspirational paper of Father Talbot's. I notice it held you all as it held myself. The one regret is that it was not just a little bit longer. We generally like small subjects and short papers, but I think this is one of the occasions when we might have had more from Father Talbot. It was a delight for us to find out how wonderful the Church is in her saints; to find a paper here on the early Jesuit Missioner Martyr and to prove that he was a little old New Yorker. I know from what I have been reading about Father Jogues, and ought to know from what I have heard in some of the lectures on him, that every time one of those fascinating stories, one of those attractive lives in the history of the Church is told, it makes us all feel ashamed of ourselves. They have done so much for us, for the Church, so much for Christ that when we do something, it is so small in comparison to what has been done by the martyrs.

"I know that I am talking to those who are strong in their desire to do something for Christ because we are living in a wonderful day. People today, I realize, live amidst many difficulties and our Catholic people are following Christ. So may we be consoled by the martyr of the Mohawk Valley, and may the day soon come when he will be a canonized saint, and that we will gladly bend our knee in further reverence to him, and ask that the benediction of his sacrifice continue upon our State, the Empire State, and upon ourselves.

"I wish to congratulate the officers, and of course, especially Mr. Meehan and Mr. Horgan, for the production of this volume. It was very gracious of Mr. Huntington to have afforded the opportunity to do so. He made possible the execution of the thought that came into the mind of the officers. We ought to admire Mr. Huntington very much. He is not a Catholic, but his Hispanic

Museum is a marvel. What he preserves there in the way of art, literature, and history is a tribute to the Church. And it is in line with an experience I have had in the last few years, with one of our United States bishops who has lived in Spain, (not a Catholic either). He came and told me that Catholics in America do not appreciate Spain as they should. He told me the city of Madrid, a city of a million people, in a year has had only four or five murders. They did not have more than seven or eight highway robberies. That is in Spain. There is no need to draw a comparison. This non-Catholic spoke of the beautiful Catholic family life, and so on, and here tonight a beautiful tribute was paid to Mexico.

"Mr. President, you spoke with real feeling, and paid a real tribute to the first Bishop of Mexico. Mexico means so much, and we have to be so careful lest in the slightest measure we have any sympathy with the people who today are so hostile to it, even in our own supposedly great America. Mexico began her culture immediately of the Indians. Just imagine, the short time it was after the discovery that the endeavor of the Church was made to bring them education and culture. She did not kill them, did not shoot them, did not massacre them, did not drive them from their possessions. One of the first universities and colleges was in Mexico; the first institutions of charity, taking care of the helpless, sick, homeless and so on, were in Mexico.

"And when your own first Archbishop of New York, Archbishop Hughes, was in dire stress, the Church needed funds in New York City, he appealed to Mexico, and the Mexican people listened to the appeal for New York and contributed generously to the Church in New York. So, lest we forget, let us from time to time recall these things.

"We have here tonight another Jesuit, Bishop Diaz, who has seen the present persecution going on. He is here an exile from his country and we are very glad to have him here tonight, and I am delighted to think that he has also received a copy of this "Doctrina Breve," and he will carry it away as a souvenir of the expression of love and affection of the Church in the United States, the Church in New York, of the Hierarchy, clergy, Religious and the Faithful.

"While listening here I could not help but think of my own re-

cent voyage to the Island of San Salvador. The Bahama Islands, as you know, are a part of the Archdiocese of New York, although British territory. The English papers carried pictures of myself administering Confirmation, saying that an American Cardinal is visiting his British flock. The picture shows me in my Cardinal red, in a rowboat, saying good-bye to those whom I had confirmed. It was very interesting.

"The Island of San Salvador is 200 miles by sea from Nassau; that means 200 miles of travel by sea—400 miles just for a confirmation of perhaps not more than fifteen or sixteen souls. And I was very anxious three years ago to reach San Salvador, but I found it was impossible to get anywhere. And none other than the present Ambassador to Mexico, Mr. Dwight Morrow, was there at the time. He heard the plight I was in and offered to try and bring me over to San Salvador. He did everything he possibly could to see if he could get some kind of craft. It was impossible. This time I was able to reach the island on which Columbus landed. Up to a recent date it was called, as you know, Watling's Island, but the name was changed back to its original title of San Salvador, and a new wireless station put up there, which was formerly called Watling is now called San Salvador. There is a jump across the centuries again. Through the generosity of the Knights of Columbus, we possess the land where the first landing was made.

"I was reading the other day that it was not until Archbishop Corrigan's time, in 1899, that the first Catholic church was built in the Bahamas. So you see, these are all interesting items that might be told on an occasion of this kind, and we all ought to think of them. I say these things to you that you might appreciate the work being done by the members of the Society. It is a work that everybody cannot do, and it demands patience and wisdom and besides patience and wisdom, you've got to know something. These gentlemen who do these things year after year know something, and the know something that they have is something you cannot buy. It has grown up as part of themselves; it is the accumulated experience of years and years of study and concentration along the very dusty line of research. Thank God we have the present Society, thank God we have such officers, thank God we have such scholars.

"And so I wish once more to express how happy I am to be here tonight. Moreover, I wish to take notice of the very splendid audience we have here. I do not know whether you had a promoter or accelerator. This is entirely natural, you know. There is nothing artificial about this. Perhaps it was Father Talbot who brought you here. It cannot be myself, because I was here last week. But I do most of all wish you all to continue your interest in the Society, whose monuments are very important. You know there is no other organization in the world that is so consecrated to the historial monuments as the Church. She taught a great lesson all through history, and as you know there would not have been any research to be made if it had not been for her great protection of the scholar all through the centuries. No matter what war came, pestilence, famine, the Church was the patron; and the Church was anxious for her own records, she kept the records of important achievements.

"So, dear people here, I oft times think that in our great busy life we have many distractions that tend to get us a little bit away from that Catholic sense of ours. I know you do not want to do so, but we do get away from it. When we have it we ought to cherish it and hold it tight.. We ought to keep that Catholic sense. It will guide us in so many ways. It will make us so happy; it will make us understandable in regard to so many things, and it will give us a light, and wherever we go we will unconsciously radiate our fine Catholic spirit, and that will do all manner of good among people with whom we come in contact. So tonight I feel we all have profited by the evening. May God bless you all."

THE PRESENTATION TO THE HOLY FATHER

The representatives of the United States Catholic Historical Society were honored in Rome at a private audience given on June 9, 1928, by His Holiness Pope Pius XI., at which a beautifully bound copy of America's oldest book, the "Doctrina Breve," printed by Bishop Zumárraga, in the City of Mexico, in June, 1544, and reproduced in facsimile by the society was presented for the Vatican Library.

The committee was made up of the Executive Secretary of the Society, Miss E. P. Herbermann; her sister, Miss Louise Herbermann, and Miss Cornelia Craigie. His Eminence Cardinal Hayes, the official head of the Society, gave them a formal letter of introduction, and the Very Rev. Monsignor Joseph A. Breslin, Vice-Rector of the American College, acted as their chaperon in presenting them to the Holy Father and explaining their mission.

Miss Herbermann then offered the book with a letter signed by the editor, Thomas F. Meehan, and his associates of the publication committee, Percy J. King and Henry Ridder, expressing their filial loyalty to the Holy See and asking the acceptance of this token of their zeal for the honor and fame of the Church.

The Holy Father most graciously received the book, which is bound in white leather, hand tooled in gold and lined with white moire silk, and stood several minutes looking over its pages. When he came to the facsimile reproduction of the old black letter type of 1544, his well-known love of books was manifested by repeated exclamations of pleasure as he scanned and turned the leaves of the volume.

He then asked Miss Herbermann details about the Historical Society and read the letter from the editor and his associates and said: "Thank you, very much," after which he drew back a little and told the committee, who were on their knees, that he blessed them, their relatives and the members of the Historical Society and their work.

The members of the committee were further favored by invitations to the special Mass which the Holy Father celebrated on

the feast of Corpus Christi when they received Holy Communion from his hands.

The facsimile reproduction of this historic book by the United States Catholic Historical Society, which has thus been added to the collection in the Vatican Library, has already excited the warm approval and interest of bibliophiles all over the country. A number of requests for copies have come to the office of the Society, 346 Convent avenue, New York, from libraries and collectors.

His Eminence Cardinal Hayes publicly on two occasions enthusiastically referred to the publication and in a letter to the editor said: "I tried to express my appreciation last evening, but I know inadequately, for the society's bound volume which I value very highly. I again congratulate your on your very fine work."

In a letter from His Eminence Cardinal O'Connell of Boston, he writes: "I have received the copy of the 'Doctrina Breve' and I assure you that I deeply appreciate your kind thought. The reproduction of the 'Doctrina Breve' is a genuine event of first importance."

An acknowledgment from His Eminence Cardinal Dougherty of Philadelphia, says: " . . . I had the pleasure of receiving a copy of 'Doctrina Breve,' which I find very beautiful and interesting. It was good of you to bear me in mind and to send me this present which I prize. Please do accept the expression of my gratitude."

The editor of the Ave Maria in an appreciative notice of the facsimile says: "A handsome volume of exceptional value and interest is this."

The one perfect copy of the "Doctrina Breve," it will be remembered, is included in the treasures Archer M. Huntington has gathered in the New York library of the Hispanic Society of America. It was by his generous courtesy and cooperation that the United States Catholic Historical Society was able to reproduce this priceless example of the earliest printing press of the New World, and tell the modern scoffing public that it was the work of a Catholic Bishop.

ANNUAL ELECTION OF OFFICERS

The annual meeting of the United States Catholic Historical Society took place on Wednesday evening, December 19, 1928, at the Catholic Club, 120 Central Park South, the formal business of the occasion being the reports of the secretary and of the treasurer and the election of officers for the ensuing year.

The reports of the executive officials showed the affairs of the Society to be in a very satisfactory condition and the following new members were proposed and elected to the association: Rt. Rev. Mgr. C. F. Thomas, Very Rev. William L. Mullany, Rev. W. E. Cashin, Rev. Edward J. Hickey, Ph.D., Patrick J. O'Keefe, John C. Dempsey, Albert H. Griffith, John W. McCarthy, A.M., John McManus, Robert J. Reilly, John P. Bramer, O. H. LaFarge, John S. Little, St. Francis Seminary, St. Francis, Wisconsin.

The outstanding incidents of the closing year were the publication of the Society's RECORDS and STUDIES and the reproduction in facsimile of the oldest extant American book, the "Doctrina Breve" (Mexico, 1544), which has been acclaimed as a distinct accomplishment in the literary world. The Executive Secretary of the Society and two associates went to Rome with the formal introduction of His Eminence Cardinal Hayes, Honorary President of the Society, and presented a special copy of the book to the Holy Father at a private audience. His Holiness expressed the greatest pleasure at this gift for the Vatican Library and praised in enthusiastic terms the make-up and appearance of the volume. He evidenced great interest in the work of the Society and gave his blessing to it collectively and individually.

Other copies of the "Doctrina Breve" were presented to Cardinal Merry del Val, to Archbishop Marchetti, director of Propaganda, and to the Jesuit and the Dominican curias, and received equally flattering commendations. Very complimentary letters of the same tenor were received from Their Eminences Cardinals O'Connell and Dougherty.

The election of these officers for the ensuing year then took place in accordance with the rules of the Society: Honorary

president, His Eminence Patrick Cardinal Hayes, D.D.; president, Percy J. King; vice-president, Joseph H. Fargis; treasurer, Henry Ridder; corresponding secretary, the Rev. James E. Noonan; recording secretary, Arthur F. J. Rémy, Ph.D.; librarian, the Right Rev. Monsignor Joseph F. Delany, D.D.; trustees, The Rev. Thomas P. Phelan, Joseph F. Keany, Dennis C. Fauss, Thomas F. Meehan, Frederic J. Fuller, the Rev. Brother Thomas; councillors: The Right Rev. Monsignor John P. Chidwick, D.D., Edward J. McGuire, Arthur Kenedy, William J. Amend, John E. Donnelly, John G. Coyle, M.D.; the Rev. Gerald C. Treacy, S.J.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The following letter from the Trustees of St. Peter's Church, Barclay Street, New York, to Bishop John Carroll, is preserved in the Cathedral archives at Baltimore:

New York, June 11, 1806.

"If to be impressed with the highest respect and warmest affection for the venerable prelate whose pious zeal watches over the concerns of our most holy religion in this country and whose virtues display its purity by a criterion of attachment to religion itself, we the undersigned Trustees of this church feel a consciousness of that attachment in the sincerity with which we offer our good bishop our expression of those sentiments towards his venerated and beloved person.

"Actuated by that attachment and divested of all prejudice and partiality with respect to persons but what results from it we beg, Sir, you will also accept the assurance of our zealous cooperation to the extent (of) our power and duties both as individual members of the congregation and in our corporate capacity in conveying into beneficial effect every measure your wisdom and piety may suggest for the promotion and respectability of Catholicity here and the fostering those virtues both in the clergy and laity, the want of which in either must be productive of injury and disgrace to the most sacred institutions.

"We pray Almighty God to prolong a life so eminently directed to the advancement of His glory and the promotion of His holy religion, and that the remainder of your natural journey may be comfortable and happy till it shall please Him to reward your pious labors with a crown of never ending felicity. (Signed) Thomas Stoughton, Cornelius Heeney, Andrew Morris, Michael Roth, John Hoes, John Byrne, John Hinton."

Old St. Peter's, the senior congregation of the State, can claim two of three candidates for the honors of the altar whose processes for beatification are now being considered at Rome: Mother Seton, founder of the American Sisters of Charity, and Mother Adelaide of St. Teresa (O'Sullivan) who born in the parish, October 8, 1817, died, April 15, 1893, Prioress of the

Carmel at Grajal del Campo, Spain, where she was revered as a modern St. Teresa. The third candidate, Blessed Isaac Jogues, S. J., came to the parish district after his rescue from his cruel Mohawk captors. It is probable that it was the care he there received from the good Dutch Samaritans that enabled him to go back to his native France whence, reinvigorated, he returned to a glorious martyrdom in New York.

The parish sent to the Sacred College the first American Cardinal, John McCloskey, and to the Jesuit novitiate at Frederick, Md. (November 1813) the first native New Yorker to be ordained a priest, James A. Neill (1828). Father Neill's mother was first cousin to Mother Teresa Lalor, founder of the Visitation Sisters in the United States, and there is a quaint letter he wrote to his uncle Peter Burtsell, from Georgetown College, telling him of his intention to become a Jesuit novice. At that time (1813) Mr. Burtsell's residence was No. 10 Wall street. Fancy what such a location would mean today! The Right Rev. Mgr. Richard Lalor Burtsell of a later generation also was of this family.

Susan Clossy, New York's first novice for Mother Seton's newly organized Sisters of Charity, went to Emmitsburg, in May, 1809, from St. Peter's. Her father's name occurs frequently in the early records of the old church as an efficient participant in the parish activities. If its records from 1784 to the present were carefully examined it is certain that, including the foregoing, the list of vocations to be credited to old St. Peter's would place the parish high up, if not at the head, of the roll of honor.

Mother Adelaide of St. Teresa O'Sullivan, Prioress of the Carmel at Grajal del Campo in the diocese of Leon, Spain, was born in old St. Peter's parish, New York City, October 8, 1817, her ancestors belonging to the ancient Irish sept of the O'Sullivans of Bantry, County Cork. Her grandfather, Herbert Thomas O'Sullivan, served as an officer in the British Army, and came to New York after the Revolution and settled here with his family. His son John Thomas in time became active in local affairs and was sent as a United States Consul to the Barbary States, North Africa, and while there met and married during a visit to Gibraltar an English lady named Mary Rouley. She was a non-Catholic and he was lax enough in the practise of his Faith to

allow her to bring up their six children in the Episcopalian denomination.

Adelaide was their fourth child. In 1821, when she was four years old, Father Benedict J. Fenwick, S.J., who was associated with Father Kohlmann, S.J., in St. Peter's and St. Patrick's pastorates, met her while visiting her father's home, and impressed by her precocity, obtained permission to instruct her and baptized her with her father's consent. The latter seemed to thus recall some of his early fervor and watched her progress in the four years that followed until his sudden death at sea. After this there was some opposition on the part of the family to a continuation of her Catholic practises, but, aided by a pious Catholic seamstress employed in the household, she persevered.

In 1835 when Adelaide was eighteen the family moved to Washington, D. C., and here she went to the Visitation Convent at Georgetown as a music pupil and thus came under the influence of the famous Sister Stanislaus Jones whose name is so prominent in Visitation records. After a time she expressed a desire to enter the Community, and in spite of the strong opposition of her brother John did so in 1837. Her spiritual fervor later led her to desire a stricter contemplative life according to the Rule of St. Teresa, and, following the advice of the distinguished New York pastor, Father Felix Varela, she withdrew from the Visitation Convent and went to Cuba and was received into the Discalced Carmelite Convent at Havana on October 15, 1840. Here she remained, practising as far as she was allowed, the austerities of the Teresian Rule. Owing to the political troubles in Cuba she could not take her final Carmelite vows and to do this she left Havana and went to the Carmel at Guatemala, Central America, where the Rule was observed in all its primitive fervor, and there on October 4, 1843, received the Carmelite habit. She made her formal profession October 11, 1844.

Candid, modest, prudent, her life was a mirror of the virtues and the Community soon began to appreciate her spiritual perfections and so in 1858 she was made Mistress of Novices in which office she was such a success, that at the election in 1868 she was unanimously chosen Prioress. In a short time she not only advanced the standing of the Community but became an influential local personage. This continued until 1873 when a revo-

lution put anti-clericals in control of the Government of Guatemala under Barrios and the following year she and her Sisters were expelled from their convent and she went back to Havana where they arrived December 5, 1875. While waiting to secure a new location Bishop Gross of Savannah, Ga., invited them to come and make a foundation in his diocese, and they accepted and reached Savannah on August 30, 1877. There were nine Sisters and after a short experience there it was found that the plan was not practicable, and under the direction of Father Terenziani, S.J., of New York, the Sisters left Savannah, and, in September, 1879, came to a house that had been secured for them at Yonkers with the idea of a permanent foundation in New York. They stayed in it for a year and on the expiration of their lease accepted the invitation of Sister Irene and went to live with the Sisters of Charity at the Foundling Asylum in East Sixty-eighth street.

The plan of remaining in New York did not materialize and after considering an invitation to go to Toronto, Mother Adelaide finally decided by advice of Father Salerino, S.J., to go to the diocese of Leon, Spain. Her brother John and a Spanish gentleman, Gabino Gutierrez accompanied the party of seven Sisters and four novices on this voyage. The Bishop of Leon gave them a warm welcome and finally an old Franciscan monastery at Grajal del Campo was secured for them and they settled there in peace.

From that time until her death April 15, 1893, she ruled the Community with the greatest success, her resemblances to St. Teresa's austere life and accomplishments giving her a fame and prestige that spread all over Spain. The diocesan Process for her beatification was begun and all its formal details have been carried out and the results are now in Rome where the postulators of her Cause anticipate the happiest results. A magazine published by the Carmelite Fathers of Alba Tormes, Spain, devotes a special section to favors granted through her intercession and each issue has a number of them.

Her brother, John T. O'Sullivan, was a man of distinguished ability and locally prominent in New York. He was a member of the State legislature in the early forties, editor of the *Democratic Review* and a paper called the *News* and served as United States Minister to Portugal from 1854 to 1860. President Polk

mentions him a number of times in his "Diary," notably (May 10, 1848) as the first to suggest the purchase of Cuba from Spain and then the admission of the island as a State of the Union. When the Bartholdi Statue of Liberty in New York Bay was unveiled he delivered the address in French. He died in his eighty-third year and happily became a convert before his death. His sister Mary also received the grace of faith and married a man named Samuel Saugtree. Their daughter became a Religious of the Sacred Heart. A very interesting pamphlet detailing the career of Mother Adelaide has been prepared by Father A. F. Valerson, O.C.D., and is published by the *Little Flower Magazine,* Oklahoma City, Okla., with the imprimatur of Bishop Francis C. Kelley.

Owing, no doubt, to the Spanish sources of information used by the compiler of this pamphlet there are a number of chronological and historical inaccuracies in regard to New York. These, however, do not detract from its interest or value.

A Stray Sheep of the Last Century

Near the entrance of Grace Church, the fashionable Episcopalian edifice that fronts the turn of Broadway at Tenth street, New York, there is set in the northeast wall an old white marble memorial slab in which is cut this inscription:

"Sacred to the memory of Michael Hogan,
During many years a resident of this city;
Born at Stone Hall in the County of Clare, Ireland, September 29, A. D. 1766.
In early manhood a bold and successful navigator and discoverer in Seas then almost unknown;
In mature years, a prosperous merchant;
The decline of life was not unmarked by vicissitudes of fortune.
But prosperity did not elate nor could adversity subdue his firm and constant spirit.
Each quarter of the Globe bore witness of his enterprise and its success.
Regretted by his friends, respected by his enemies
A life of stainless integrity, closed at the City of Washington, March 26, A. D., 1833, Aetatis 67."

Many who have visited the church have often wondered at this quaint epitaph and how it came about that Michael Hogan from

the County Clare finally drifted into such an environment. Old St. Patrick's churchyard, further down the East side would seem to be the much more appropriate and natural place of sepulture. But there is nothing in the all too few and most unsatisfactory local records of the progress of the probable church of Hogan's ancestors that mentions his name in connection with any of the events of his day and time, and might thus fix his ecclesiastical affiliations. The old slab is inserted in the Grace Church wall between memorials to Moses Rogers, one of the founders of the church, and the famous Cadwallader D. Golden, several times Mayor of the city, Senator and Representative in Congress, thus indicating the appreciation in which Hogan was held by the Grace Church corporation.

Hogan's local history is full of interest in the details set down in Barrett's "Old Merchants" and other commercial chronicles. After navigating the unknown seas, as his epitaph tells us, he reached New York in 1804 and settled down to live on Staten Island. He brought with him, according to tradition, a fortune of £400,000 in gold and of course his advent created much local excitement. He was then thirty-eight years old and had been in his ship all over the word, in Asia, Africa, and the then almost unknown Australia. From the East Indies he brought a wife, a dark-skinned lady reputed to be a Begum or princess, and the source of much of his great wealth. They had four children, a son and three daughters.

After being here for some time he thought he would like to go into trade. There were a number of rich Irish merchants, importers here in the early years of the last century, like Daniel McCormick, Thomas Suffern, James McBride, John Clendenning, John McVicer, William Edgar, John Shaw, the brothers Carlisle and George Pollack, John Adams, John McLaren, and others. So Michael Hogan for his mercantile experiment took the store No. 225 Broadway, where the Astor House used to be and filled it up with a costly stock of dry goods that was at once the talk of the town. There is no record of any of his "bargain sales," but as was the custom of the day, he lived over the store.

He tired of this venture in two years and disposed of his concern. He then moved down to the fashionable section of No. 52 Greenwich street, which he bought. One of his neighbors in No.

48 was the Rev. John Henry Hobart of Trinity church, even then the most noted preacher of his denomination in the city. He and Hogan became great friends and the Irishman not only was among the zealous members of his flock but, having some literary talent contributed frequently to the pages of the *Churchman's Magazine,* a publication that Dr. Hobart started in 1808. The monument to Hogan was first put up in the vaults of the old Grace Church down town on Broadway just below Trinity, and when that was torn down it was taken up town to the new Grace Church and set in its present position when that structure was built in the early forties.

Hogan went into trade again at No. 82 Washington street, in a general shipping, importing and commission business largely in the West Indies, importing big cargoes of Spanish and other brandies. He entertained lavishly, his dinners being attended by all the leading social lights and distinguished foreigners who found him a most attractive host, his extensive travels giving him an inexhaustible fund of adventure and story for the entertainment of his guests. In the course of years he met with ill luck. Some of his large operations resulted disastrously and he lost much of his money. Then the War of 1812 brought havoc to the shipping trade and after it was over he failed.

Sympathetic friends had him appointed United States Consul at Valpariso, South America, and he went there with his wife and one of his daughters. After serving some time he got disgusted with the job, came back to the United States and went to Washington to be near his son, William, who was a member of Congress and he died there, as his epitaph says on March 26, 1833.

This son William married Sallie Clendenning, a daughter of John Clendenning, who brought him a large fortune, most of which, however, was lost in the smash of the United States Bank. The young couple went to live in Franklin County, and the town of Hogansburgh in that county of the State is named after them. William was elected a Member of Assembly there in 1823, and served the district as a judge and in Congress from 1831 to 1833. He subsequently became a clerk in the State Department at Washington. At Hogansburgh there is a rural church, St. Patrick's, and the parish records say the Hogans were generous to it at the start.

Of Hogan's daughters, the eldest, Frances, remained single; Harriet, the second, married a local doctor, and Sophia, the third, married a man named Donnelly, who was drowned on Far Rockaway beach, November 21, 1836, in the famous wreck of the ship Bristol as he was returning with his wife and children from a trip abroad on the ship. Mrs. Donnelly and the children with their nurse were saved with the other women and children, landing in the first boat. The boats returned to the wreck twice and each time Donnelly yielded his chance to get off to others. In the next attempt the boats were swamped, the crew became discouraged with the increased violence of the storm. Those still on the ship were left to their fate. Donnelly and the others, twenty in all, took to the rigging in the foremast, which soon went to the bottom, and all but one, a passenger named Briscoe, were drowned. In all seventy-seven of the one hundred souls on the Bristol were lost. A monument which records this disaster, and that of the wreck of the Mexico, on January 2, 1837, on Hempstead beach, in which sixty-two persons were drowned, was subsequently erected near Hempstead "partly by the money found upon their persons and partly by the contributions of the benevolent and humane in the County of Queens."

Hogan's country seat was the picturesque knoll at the head of what is now the Riverside Drive and best known, perhaps, today because it is the location of a popular restaurant and the site of the oft-inspected lonely grave with its headstone erected to the memory of "St. Clair Pollock an amiable child."

Michael Hogan bought the tract in 1806 from the executors of the estate of Gulian Verplank and called it "Claremont" in honor of his native county of Clare, Ireland. In 1821 he sold the property to Joel Post whose heirs had it when it was taken by the city for a public park. The story of St. Clair Pollock, the "amiable child," nephew of another Irishman, George Pollock, who owned the adjoining land, need not be told here, except that the boy, five years old, was drowned while on a fishing trip nearby with his father, July 15, 1797, and when the property was sold the deed provided that the grave should be preserved. Claremont avenue on Morningside Heights was named for the estate of Michael Hogan, who built the large white house in Riverside Park, just beyond Grant's Tomb. When Hogan erected the old mansion his

estate extending over that part of Morningside Heights was known as Claremont, and when the avenue between Broadway and Riverside was laid out from 116th street north to 127th street, late in the last century, it was named after the Hogan homestead.

Catholic Traditions of the White House

The advent of a new President at the White House recalls some historical Catholic connections with the official residence of our Presidents. It was designed and built by the Catholic Irishman, James Hoban, and furnished by the Catholic Frenchman, John Frederic LaFarge, father of the artist, John LaFarge, and grandfather of the Rev. John LaFarge, S.J., Associate Editor of *America,* which adds an interesting note to the records of that family published in Volume XVIII of Records and Studies.

When the British burned the capital in 1814 the White House was almost destroyed. Fortunately Hoban was still available, and its rebuilding, according to his original design, was entrusted to him. The restoration went on slowly, and when President Monroe was inaugurated in 1817, Congress appropriated $20,000 for the necessary furniture. The Monroes had resided abroad and, accustomed to the elegancies of fine living, knew that the appropriate furnishings could not then be procured on this side of the Atlantic. President Monroe therefore sent to France for the necessary articles, giving the commission to the Franco-American merchant firm of Russell and LaFarge, of Havre, of which Mr. John Frederic LaFarge was the active member there. Under date of September 15, 1817, they wrote to President Monroe:

"Sir: Our Mr. Russell having been detained at Bordeaux by business, transmitted us the orders he received from your Excellency for the purpose of the furniture for the palace of the President at Washington. Our Mr. LaFarge went to Paris in the beginning of June for this purpose, when the result of inquiries soon convinced him that there was no possibility of purchasing anything ready made, and in order to comply with the instruction of your Excellency of 23 April, he was under the necessity of ordering the whole of the furniture to be made, that he might be sure to obtain such articles as united strength with elegance of form and combining at the same time simplicity of

ornament with the richness suitable to the decoration of a house occupied by the first Magistrate of a free nation.

"There are many articles bought under the price which your Excellency had fixed, but one of the most important is the furniture for the large oval room, which costs a great deal more than what your Excellency had calculated and which is caused by the change which we have been obliged to make of gild wood instead of mahogany. The result of that substitution has been an increase of expense for the trimmings of the Fauteuils, &c., and the draperies of the curtains, which must be richer, that everything might be in harmony. We should also add that mahogany is not generally admitted in the furniture of a salon, even at private gentlemen's houses."

Eight months later the same firm of Russell and LaFarge wrote:

"The crystal and gilt bronze luster, of superior workmanship, had originally been ordered by the French Government and if it were to be made again would cost 5,000 francs.

"The furniture for the large oval room is much higher than the prices limited; it must be ascribed to the gilt wood and the crimson silk trimmings, fringes, &c., which is 50 per cent. dearer than other colors. The gilt wood was made by the first ebeniste in Paris, of the name of Bellanger. The silks were brought for us by Cartier fils and we had the whole made up by Leveissier, a very good tapissier. Being obliged to take a piano from Erard we could not get any other ready made but the one sent. The surtout is very handsome—it has been made by the best manufacturers in Paris, who lost by it nearly 2,000 francs. The dessert set of porcelain has been manufactured by Dagoty. The plate has been manufactured by Fauconnier."

The crystal and gilt bronze luster mentioned above (and which was placed in the Oval Room) carried fifty lights, having four arms in the form of an eagle very richly gilded and also branches of fruit decoration. It cost 2,800 francs.

The furniture imported for the sitting room or parlor (now the Red Room), consisted of a round mahogany table with three columnar supports on a triangular socle, the capitals and other ornaments of carved and gilded bronze with white marble top and a mahogany console table with mirror at back, columns

with ornaments of gilded bronze and marble top, which were, of course, pure Empire in style. Here stood the handsome Erard piano with its four pedals and "tambourin attachment."

The restored White House was opened to the public on New Year's Day, 1818, although the President's family were able to occupy it during the previous September. The details of the furniture, draperies, ornaments, etc., sent from France by Mr. LaFarge, are preserved in the official records, but unfortunately only a few of them can still be found in the White House. The individual tastes of each Administration wrought changes that were made without regard for the canons of Paris in the arts of interior decorations, or of the formal needs of an official mansion. Lately, however, there has been a happy change and a practical effort to restore, in perfect proportion and design, the furnishings of the Executive Mansion to conform to what has been so aptly described as "the chaste simplicity of sophisticated taste and the expression of a highly accomplished architect."

UNITED STATES CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Honorary President

His Eminence Patrick Cardinal Hayes

President

Percy J. King

Vice-President

Joseph H. Fargis, LL.D.

Treasurer

Henry Ridder

Corresponding Secretary

Rev. James E. Noonan

Recording Secretary

Arthur F. J. Rémy, Ph.D.

Executive Secretary

E. P. Herbermann

Librarian

Rt. Rev. Mgr. Joseph F. Delany, D.D.

Trustees

Joseph F. Keany — Dennis C. Fauss
Thomas F. Meehan — Frederic J. Fuller
Rev. Brother Thomas

Councillors

Rt. Rev. Mgr. John P. Chidwick, D.D. — Edward J. McGuire, John E. Donnelly
Rev. Gerald C. Treacy, S.J. — Arthur Kenedy
William J. Amend — Rev. Thomas P. Phelan
John G. Coyle, M.D.

Members

Adams, Robert A.
Adams, T. Albeus
Agar, John G.
Amend, William J.
Barrett, Alfred M.
Barrett, Daniel J.
Barrett, Nicholas J.
Benziger, Alfred F.
Benziger, Bruno
Benziger, Louis G.

Bister, John
Blake, Michael
Bowron, Mrs. Clara A.
Boston College Library
Boston Public Library
Brady, Very Rev. Mgr. John F.
Bramer, John Philip
Breslin, Rev. P. N.
Breslin, T. J.
Bristed, C. A.
Britt, Philip J.
Broderick, Daniel I.
Bronson, Addison W.
Brophy, Mrs. W. H.
Brown, John B.
Buchanan, Mrs. E. J.
Burke, Prof. Edmund
Byrne, James
Campbell, Rev. Joseph C.
Campbell, Francis P.
Capuchin Fathers, N. Y.
Carey, Peter J.
Carroll, Cornelius
Cashin, Rev. W. E.
Cavanaugh, Richard B.
Churchill, Thomas W.
Chute, Elizabeth
Clare, William F.
Clarke, Richard H.
Cleary, John J.
Coakley, Rev. Dr. Thomas F.
Cohan, George M.
Coke, P. M.
Collier, Mrs. Robert
Columbia College, Dubuque, Iowa
Conboy, Martin
Condon, John F., M.D.
Conley, Louis D.
Columbia Univ. Library
Connolly, Rt. Rev. Mgr. Arthur T.
Connolly, Rt. Rev. Mgr. James N.
Connolly, Thos. F. J.
Conroy, Charles C.
Conway, Thomas F.
Costello, Rev. Charles A.
Courtney, Rev. W. A.
Coyle, John G., M.D.
Crowne, J. Vincent
Cuddihy, R. J.
Cuddihy, Arthur B.
Cunningham, John S.
Curley, Most Rev. M. J., D.D.
Curry, Francis A.
Daly, M. A.
Deitsch, Miss M.
Delany, Rt. Rev. Mgr. Joseph F., D.D.
Delehanty, Hon. F. B.
Dempsey, John C.
Detroit Public Library
Donahue Library, San Francisco, Cal.
Donnelly, Rt. Rev. Mgr. E. J., V.F.
Donnelly, John E.
Donoghue, Hon. F. X.
Doody, Rev. Daniel
Dooley, Michael E.
Dooley, Rev. John H.
Dowd, Rev. Richard A.
Dowling, Most Rev. Austin, D.D.

Dowling, Hon. Victor J.
Doyle, John F., Jr.
Duffy, Rev. Francis P.
Duffy, James P. B.
Durning, Harry M.
Dutton, Joseph
Ewing, Charles
Falahee, John J.
Fargis, Joseph H.
Farrell, J. F.
Farrell, James A.
Fauss, Dennis C.
Fauteux, Rev. Aegidius
Feehan, Rt. Rev. D. F., D.D.
Finn, Rev. Thomas J. LL.D.
Floyd-Jones, G. Stanton
Fox, Prof. William
Fuller, Frederic J.
Gassler, Rev. Leon
Gavegan, Hon. Edward J.
Georgetown University
Gillespie, George J.
Gleason, Rt. Rev. Mgr. Joseph M.
Grace, Joseph P.
Grady, Rev. Joseph E.
Grady, Walter L.
Griffith, Albert H.
Guertin, Rt. Rev. G. A., D.D.
Guilday, Rev. Peter, D.D.
Guinevan, Rev. Peter F.
Guthrie, William D.
Haggerty, J. Henry
Halloran, John H.
Hannigan, Stephen
Harson, M. J.
Hayes, Carroll
Hayes, His Eminence Patrick Cardinal
Hayward, Dr. V. S.
Heide, Henry
Heide, Henry, Jr.
Heide, William F.
Herbermann, Elizabeth P.
Herbermann, Henry
Herbermann, Henry F.
Hickey, Rt. Rev. Mgr. David J.
Hickey, Rev. E. J., Ph.D.
Hoey, James J.
Hoffman, Rev. Thos. A.
Hoguet, Robert L.
Holy Cross College, Worcester, Mass.
Horgan, Stephen H.
Hurley, Rt. Rev. Mgr. Edward F.
Hurley, James F.
Jeurgens, Rev. A. M.
Johnson, Alfred J.
Joyce, Michael J.
Keany, Joseph F.
Kelley, Rt. Rev. Francis C.
Kelley, Thomas B.
Kelly, Charles R.
Kelly, Mrs. Hugh
Kelly, Rev. Joseph S.
Kelly, Thomas H.
Kenedy, Arthur
Kenny, William F.
Kent, John S.
Keyes, Edward L.
King, A. J.
King, Percy J.

Kinkead, Hon. Eugene F.
LaFarge, O. H.
Larkin, William P.
Lavelle, Rt. Rev. Mgr. M. J., D.D.
Little, John S.
Linehan, Paul H.
Loyola School, New York City
Loyola University, Chicago, Ill.
Loyola University, New Orleans, La.
Lyndon, Richard P.
Lynch, Thomas M.
McBride, T. J.
McCarthy, J. A.
McCarthy, John W.
McCue, Thomas E.
McDonald, George
McElroy, Mrs. Wm. B.
McEntegart, Rev. Bryan J.
McGarey, Hon. F. D.
McGolrick, Rt. Rev. Mgr. Edward J.
McGivney, Rt. Rev. Mgr. M. J.
McGuire, Edward J.
McGuire, Joseph Hubert
McKenna, Rt. Rev. Mgr. Edward
McKenna, Thomas P.
McKeon, Mrs. Robert J.
McLoughlin, Miss Mary J.
McMahon, Rt. Rev. Mgr. Joseph H.
McManus, John
McNaboe, James F.
McPartland, John E.
Maginnis, Michael
Mahoney, J. T.
Manhattan College
Marique, Prof. Pierre
Marymount College, Tarrytown, N. Y.
Maurocordato, Alexander
Maxwell, W. J.
Mayo, Hon. John B.
Meehan, Thomas F.
Melvin, Thomas P.
Messmer, Most Rev. S. G., D.D.
Molloy, Joseph A.
Molloy, Rt. Rev. Thomas E., D.D.
Moran, James, M.D.
Morrell, Mrs. Edward
Morris, Rt. Rev. John B., D.D.
Morris, Mrs. Lewis Gouverneur
Mother Dolores, St. Vincent's Retreat, Harrison, N. Y.
Mother Superior, Academy, Mt. St. Vincent, N. Y.
Mother Superior, Sisters of Charity, Mt. St. Vincent, N. Y.
Mount St. Joseph's College, Dubuque, Iowa
Mount St. Joseph's College, Mt. St. Joseph, Ohio
Mullany, Very Rev. Wm. L.
Mullen, Rev. John T., D.C.L.
Mulqueen, Hon. Joseph F.
Murphy, Rev. J. J.
Nageleisen, Rev. J. A., P.R.
Neagle, Rev. Richard

Neeser, John G.
Neill, Charles P.
New York Foundling Asylum
Noonan, Rev. James E.
O'Brien, Dennis F.
O'Brien, Dr. John F.
O'Brien, Morgan J.
O'Brien, Rev. John J.
O'Brien, Kenneth
O'Boyle, James F.
O'Connor, John L.
Odiorne, Mrs. Ruth C.
O'Gorman, Hon. James A.
O'Gorman, Richard
Ohligschloger, J. B.
O'Keefe, Patrick James
O'Keefe, Rt. Rev. Mgr. T. M.
O'Leary, Dennis
O'Marra, Rev. Patrick A.
O'Neill, Rev. John J.
O'Neill, Rev. Thomas Lantry
O'Reilly, Thomas J.
Orr, William C.
Parsons, Edward A.
Parsons, Rev. Wilfrid, S.J.
Perazzo, D.
Phelan, Rev. Thomas P.
Phelan, John F.
Prendergast, William A.
Pulleyn, John J.
Quinlan, Francis J., M.D.
Redemptorist Fathers, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Redwood, Most Rev. Francis, D.D.
Reeves, James
Reid, Rev. Charles F.
Reilly, Rev. M. A.
Reiley, Robert J.
Rémy, Prof. A. F. J.
Ridder, Henry
Roe, J. A.
Rosemont College, Rosemont, Pa.
Ryan, John D.
Salvatorian Fathers, Wisconsin
Schrembs, Rt. Rev. Joseph, D.D.
Scott, Joseph
Shahan, Rt. Rev. Thomas J., D.D.
Sheahan, Rev. J. F.
Sloane, Dr. Thomas O'Conor
St. Ambrose College, Davenport, Iowa
St. Benedict's Abbey, Atchison, Kan.
St. Bernard's Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.
St. Charles College, Catonsville, Md.
St. Francis Seminary, St. Francis, Wis.
St. John's College, Brooklyn, N. Y.
St. Louis University
St. Mary's College, Portland, Ore.
St. Mary of the Lake Seminary, Mundelein, Ill.
St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore
St. Xavier's College, Cincinnati
Stewart, Rev. W. J.

Sullivan, W. C.
Taft, Mrs. Henry W.
Thomas, Rt. Rev. Mgr. C. F.
Thomas, Brother
Thorburn, C. J.
Tobin, Rev. Francis J.
Treacy, Rev. Gerald C., S.J.
Treacy, Rev. James P., D.D.
Trew, Frances Louise
Van Antwerp, Rt. Rev. Mgr. Francis J.
Velasco, Dionisio
Verrette, Rev. Adrian
Villanova College, Pennsylvania
Wall, Charles S.
Weir, Rev. John
Whalen, Grover M.
Wickham, Rev. John E.
Wickham, Joseph F., Litt.D.
Williams, C. A.
Woodlock, Thomas F., LL.D.
Wucher, Very Rev. Theophile, S.P.M.
Wynne, Rev. John J., S.J.
Yale University Library